

THE
ANNUAL REGISTER,
1868.

ANNUAL REGISTER:

Δ

REVIEW OF PUBLIC EVENTS AT HOME

AND ABROAD,

FOR THE YEAR

1868.

NEW SERIES.

LONDON:

RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE;

LONGMANS & CO.; HAMILTON & CO.; SIMPKIN & CO.;
HOULSTON & WRIGHT; SMITH. ELDER, & CO.; E. BUMPUS, J. WALLER;
L. BOOTH; BELL & DALDY; H. SOTHERAN & CO.;
BICKERS & SON; W. HEATH; J. TOOVEY; J. WHELDON;
AND RIVINGTONS, OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE.

1869.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
Review of the State of Public Affairs at the commencement of the year—Alarm of the Fenian outbreak in Ireland extended to this country—Remarkable Speech of Lord Stanley at Bristol on the Irish difficulty—Renewal of the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland—Retirement of Lord Derby in consequence of illness—Mr. Disraeli becomes First Lord of the Treasury—His professions as to the policy of his Cabinet—Remarks of Mr. Bouverie on that policy—Severe animadversions of Earl Russell on the course pursued by the Government in the last Session—Abandonment of Voting by Proxy in the House of Lords—Act passed for the Discontinuance of Public Executions . . .	[1

CHAPTER II.

Parliamentary Reform and Electoral Law—Scottish Reform Bill—Discussions on the proposition to increase the number of the House by the addition of Seven Members for Scotland—Mr. Baxter's proposition to disfranchise Seven small Boroughs in England is carried—The Bill is passed—The Irish Reform Bill is brought in by the Earl of Mayo—The Proposition for the Redistribution of Seats is abandoned—The Bill is passed, but with strong expressions as to its incompleteness in both Houses—The Boundary Bill for England and Wales—Recommendations of the Boundary Commissioners—Petitions of various Boroughs against the proposed adjustment referred to a Select Committee, whose rival propositions are ultimately adopted—The same controversy arises in the House of Lords, but the Bill is finally passed as sent up from the House of Commons—Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices Prevention Bill—A Bill in accordance with the Recommendation of the Select Committee of 1867 to transfer this jurisdiction to the Judges, is eventually passed in preference to all other propositions—The Registration of Voters Bill, to accelerate the Elections, and enable Parliament to meet before the end of 1868, is passed with general concurrence	[18
--	-----

CHAPTER III.

Affairs of Ireland—The great Question of Disestablishing the Irish Church—Abortive results of measures on Land Tenure—The Ecclesiastical Titles Act—Select Committee on, in the House of Lords—General Discussion on the Condition of Ireland in the House of Commons—The Earl of Mayo explains the	
---	--

remedial measures of the Government—Mr. Gladstone announces his policy of Disestablishing the Irish Church—Lord Stanley's Amendment to defer the Irish Question to a new Parliament is negatived by a Majority of 60—The House resolves to go into Committee on Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions relative to the Disconnexion of the Established Church of Ireland—Great interest manifested by the Public in the Irish Church Question—Earl Russell addresses a large gathering of supporters of Disestablishment at St. James's Hall—Rival Meeting of the Conservatives at the same place—Debate in the House of Lords on the proposed policy of Mr. Gladstone [44]

CHAPTER IV.

The Irish Church and Disestablishment—Mr. Gladstone's first Resolution condemnatory of the Establishment is carried by a Majority of 65—Mr. Disraeli asks for an Adjournment to consider the Ministerial position—Explanations in both Houses as to the interview of the Premier with her Majesty—The conduct of Ministers is severely criticized by Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Lowe—Great Meeting of Bishops, Peers, and other eminent persons at St. James's Hall, to protest against Disestablishment—Mr. Gladstone's second and third Resolutions are carried—Discussions respecting the Maynooth Grant and the Regium Donum—Her Majesty's answer to the Address of the House respecting Her rights of Patronage in the Church of Ireland—The Suspensory Bill to prevent the Filling up of Vacant Sees and Benefices passes the Houses of Commons—Animated Debate in the House of Lords on the Second Reading, which is negatived on a division by 192 to 97—Result of the division . . . [78]

CHAPTER V.

Financial Affairs—The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Ward Hunt, makes his Financial Statement—Deficit for the past Year—Increase of the Income Tax—The Resolutions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer are adopted—Public Expenditure—The Navy Estimates proposed by Mr. Corry, First Lord of the Admiralty—Mr. Childers' Amendment on them negatived—Motion of Mr. Seely for Reformation of Admiralty Accounts—Select Committee appointed—Mr. Graves' motion for diminishing the number of Dockyards—Army Estimates—Votes agreed to after Debate on various questions raised—Discussions on Military Organization, on the Purchase of Commissions, &c.—Important alteration in the Mutiny Bill, prohibiting Flogging of Soldiers and Marines in time of Peace, carried against the Government by Mr. Otway—The Amendment is accepted by the House of Lords—Organization of the Civil Service—Motion of Mr. Childers for extensive Reform of—The Indian Budget—Sir Stafford Northcote makes the Annual Financial Statement for India . . . [107]

CHAPTER VI.

Foreign and Colonial Policy and Affairs—Differences with the United States of America on the "Alabama" Claims—Debates in Parliament on the subject—Conciliatory Speech of Lord Stanley—Speech of Earl Russell on the same Question in the House of Lords—Mr. W. E. Forster's Motion on the indefeasible Allegiance of British Subjects—The Cretan Insurrection—Earl Russell approves the policy of the British Government—Lord Stanley vindicates his proceedings in the House of Commons—British Rule in India—The British American Colonies Confederation Act of 1867—Remonstrance of the People of Nova Scotia against the Union—Mr. Bright's Motion for a Commission of Inquiry is rejected, also a similar Motion of Lord Stratheden's in the

CONTENTS.

vii

PAGE

House of Lords—The Abyssinian Campaign—Capture of Magdala, and Death of King Theodore—The Thanks of both Houses of Parliament to the General commanding, his Officers and Men, are voted *nem. con.*—Sir Robert Napier is created a Peer, and an Annuity of 2000*l.* a year is voted to him—Attempted Assassination of the Duke of Edinburgh at Sydney—Great public indignation and anxiety—Addresses of sympathy to the Crown carried by the Lords and Commons—O'Farrel, the assailant of the Prince, is tried and executed—Warm manifestations of loyalty in Sydney—The Prince returns to England . . . [125]

CHAPTER VII.

Religion and Education—Settlement of the long-contested Church-rate Question—The Bill founded on Mr. Gladstone's Scheme Abolishing the Compulsory Payment of Church-rates is passed and sent to the Lords—Some Amendments are made by the Lords which are agreed to by the Lower House, and the Bill is passed—National Education—Bill of Mr. H. A. Bruce to authorize Compulsory Rating for the purpose of Education is withdrawn—The Bill of the Duke of Marlborough on behalf of the Government is read a Second Time, but is eventually withdrawn—Vote for Public Education—Religious Tests at the Universities—Mr. Coleridge's Bill for abolishing these Restrictions is read a Second Time, but is ultimately stopped by pressure of business—Lord Shaftesbury's Bill for restraining the excess of Ritual Observances in the Church is rejected—Disendowment of the Church in the West Indies—Controversy on this Question between the Earl of Carnarvon and the Lord Chancellor—The Bill is passed—Miscellaneous Measures passed or rejected before the close of the Session—Parliament is prorogued by Commission—Her Majesty's Speech . . . [146]

CHAPTER VIII.

The General Election—Dissolution of Parliament—Writs issued and Elections rapidly proceeded with—Large Gains of the Liberals in the English Boroughs, and in Scotland and Ireland—Success of the Conservatives in many of the English Counties—A considerable addition is made on the whole to the Liberal Majority—Defeat of Mr. Gladstone in South-West Lancashire—Operation of the "Minority Clause" in London, Glasgow, Birmingham, and other large Constituencies—Aggregate Numbers of Votes polled on each Side in the Three Kingdoms—Resignation of the Conservative Government at the conclusion of the Elections—Letter of Mr. Disraeli to his Supporters in the two Houses—Mr. Gladstone is commanded by the Queen to form an Administration—Composition of the New Cabinet—Accession of Mr. Bright to Office—Meeting of the New Parliament—Re-election of Mr. J. E. Denison, the late Speaker—The Premier's Speech on Re-election at Greenwich—Parliament is adjourned to February 16, 1869—Retrospect of the Events of the Year—Deaths of eminent Persons—Conclusion . . . [169]

FOREIGN HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.—FRANCE	[189]
CHAPTER II.—SPAIN—ITALY	[211]
CHAPTER III.—PRUSSIA—AUSTRIA—DENMARK—SERVIA—GREECE	[218]
CHAPTER IV.—ABYSSINIAN WAR	[233]
CHAPTER V.—UNITED STATES	[246]
CHAPTER VI.—UNITED STATES (<i>continued</i>)	[257]
RETROSPECT OF LITERATURE, ART, AND SCIENCE	[280]

PART II.

CHRONICLE OF REMARKABLE OCCURRENCES.

	PAGE
January	1
February	8
March	22
April	31
May	50
June	71
July	81
August	97
September	113
October	129
November	110
December	149

OBITUARY OF EMINENT PERSONS.

M. Berryer—Sir David Brewster, D.C.L., &c.—Sir James Brooke—Lord Brougham—The Archbishop of Canterbury—The Earl of Cardigan, K.C.B.—Lord Cranworth—Sir Herbert Edwards, K.C.B.—Sir E. W. Head, D.C.L., F.R.S.—C. J. Kean, F.S.A., F.R.G.S.—Sir Richard Mayne, K.C.B.—Dr. Milman—Rossini—Mr. Justice Shee—Lord Wensleydale	159
---	-----

REMARKABLE TRIALS.

The Fenian Trials	174
Lyon v. Home	187
Prosecution of Mr. Eyre. Charge of Mr. Justice Blackburn	206
Risk Allah v. "the Daily Telegraph"	217
Martin v. Mackonochie. Ritualism	226

APPENDIX.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS AND STATE PAPERS.

Report of the Royal Commissioners for inquiring into the Laws of Naturalization and Allegiance	237
--	-----

FINANCE ACCOUNTS—

1. An Account of the gross Public Income of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland	248
2. An Account of the Balances of Public Money	249

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS	250
HER MAJESTY'S MINISTERS AND CHIEF OFFICERS OF STATE	254
THE NEW HOUSE OF COMMONS	255
HIGH SHERIFFS FOR 1868	260
UNIVERSITY HONOURS	261
INDEX	273

ANNUAL REGISTER,

FOR THE YEAR

1868.

PART I.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

Review of the State of Public Affairs at the commencement of the year—Unfavourable features in the commercial and political prospects of the nation—Continued depression of the money-market and absence of speculative enterprise—Alarm of the Fenian outbreak in Ireland extended to this country—Reference to this subject in the Queen's Message to Parliament at the close of the last year—Declining tendency of the Public Revenue—Position of Lord Derby's Cabinet in public favour—Difficult questions of legislation requiring settlement—Reform Bills for Scotland and Ireland—National Education—Questions affecting the Established Church—The Irish difficulty, its formidable nature and urgent importance—Remarkable Speech of Lord Stanley at the Bristol Conservative Banquet, Ireland "the question of the hour"—Parliament re-assembles after the Recess on the 13th of February—Renewal of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland for the term of a year—Statement made by the Earl of Mayo on introducing the Bill in justification of the further suspension of the law—Statistics of Fenianism in Ireland—Remarks of Mr. Chichester Fortescue, Mr. Bagwell, and other members—The Bill is passed speedily through the House of Commons—In the Lords a debate takes place, in which the question of the Irish Church is made a leading topic—Speeches of Earl Russell, Earl Grey, the Earl of Ellenborough, and other Peers—The Bill is agreed to—Ministerial changes—The continued illness of the Prime Minister, Lord Derby, necessitates his retirement from office, and Mr. Disraeli becomes First Lord of the Treasury—Other changes in the distribution of offices—Lord Cairns succeeds Lord Chelmsford as Lord Chancellor, and Mr. Ward Hunt becomes Chancellor of the Exchequer in place of Mr. Disraeli—Announcement of these changes in both Houses, which are adjourned for a time in consequence—Mr. Disraeli addresses the members of the Conservative party at a meeting in Downing-street, and states the circumstances under which he has undertaken the leadership of the Government—Explanations are given in both Houses on their meeting again after the adjournment—Mr. Disraeli's professions as to the policy of his Cabinet—Remarks of Mr. Bouvier characterizing that policy, and on the disorganized state of the Liberal party—Severe animadversions of Earl Russell in the House of Lords upon the course pursued by the Government in the last Session—Change in the procedure of the House of Lords—Abandonment of voting by proxy—Discussion on the nature and origin of that privilege—Lord Redesdale urges its retention, but does not oppose the Motion, which is carried *nem. con.* and embodied in a Standing Order—Discontinuance of Public Executions—The Home Secretary introduces this measure, recommended by a Select Committee and strongly supported by public opinion—The Bill meets with some

opposition in the House of Commons, but is carried by large majorities in both Houses and becomes law.

IN closing our narrative of the domestic transactions of 1867 in the last volume of this work, we characterized that year as one which had left the impression of a somewhat anxious and eventful period. The occurrences which imparted this unfavourable aspect to the past, the most prominent of which were the commercial depression and the Fenian insurrection, threw a cloud also upon the opening scene of the new year. The shock given to confidence, the dulness of trade, and the stagnation of enterprise engendered by the calamitous failures of 1866 still exercised their paralyzing influence upon the money-market and straitened the means of large classes of the community; while the disquietude caused by the unsettled state of the sister country, and the apprehension of that "organized violence and assassination" which the Sovereign had lately described in her message to Parliament as having extended itself to England, perplexed the minds of politicians, and complicated the problem, so long to and insoluble, of the pacification of Ireland. In other respects the aspect of public affairs was not very encouraging. The deficient harvest of the preceding year, combined with the commercial derangements, had begun to tell upon the sources of the public revenue, and inspired the apprehension of increased taxation. The results of the Abyssinian expedition were as yet doubtful, but at the outset it appeared not an improbable conjecture that the expense of such an enterprise, even if successful, would prove greater than the provision made for it. The political state of England was tranquil, the Administration of Lord Derby, though commanding only a minority of supporters in the House of Commons, was not threatened with immediate danger, and in several of its departments was regarded as skilful and efficient, but it had still some serious difficulties to grapple with. The question of Parliamentary Reform, though settled so far as concerned the representation of England and Wales by the Act passed in 1867, still required to be dealt with in regard to the two sister kingdoms. The large and momentous subject of National Education had been marked out by public opinion, and announced by the speech from the Throne, as ripe for legislative settlement. There were also religious controversies which had of late disquieted the public mind, and caused appeals to be made to the Government for their solution. Yet above all these questions, most prominent in its magnitude, and most urgent in its pressure, towered that of the condition of Ireland. As indicating the feeling which prevailed at this period among thoughtful and sober politicians, it will be sufficient to refer to the declarations made shortly before the re-assembling of Parliament by one of the most sagacious and dispassionate of the leading public men of England, Lord Stanley. At a banquet given on the 22nd of January, at Bristol, to Her Majesty's Ministers, at which several members

of the Cabinet were present, the noble lord, in the course of his speech, passed in review the several questions which at that time occupied the public mind, and would shortly demand the intervention of the Legislature. After particularizing several of these, Lord Stanley prefaced the remarks he had to make by a forcible appeal to his hearers on the urgency of the case of Ireland. "It is one," he said, "which I suppose at the present moment is hardly ever absent from the mind of any person who takes part in public affairs. I mean the painful, the dangerous, and to us, in appearance at least, the discreditable state of things which unhappily continues to exist in Ireland. We have, indeed, in that country a strange and perplexing problem to solve. I suppose there never was a time when Englishmen of all parties and all classes were more anxious to give all reasonable satisfaction to Irish demands, and even, as far as can be done without national injury, to humour the feelings and prejudices of the Irish people. The material condition of Ireland is not bad. Certainly it is far above the average of what it has been in former years; the peasantry are better fed, better clothed, and better paid than they were twenty years ago. The more educated class share absolutely and without restriction the advantages of British citizenship. Nothing is wanted except a little peace and security for uncounted millions of British capital to pour into that country, as English wealth has poured into Scotland, and as it continues every day to pour into colonies that are separated from us by the breadth of the globe; yet it would be idle to deny that discontent is very widely spread, that dissatisfaction is not unfrequent, and that there is a portion of the population—I hope not a considerable portion, but still a portion—who regard their connexion with England as a burden rather than as a benefit. Well, that is a miserable state of things; and yet when we look for a remedy, who is there that can give us an intelligible answer?" The noble speaker went on to examine in detail the various demands made by the organs of Irish discontent for redress and satisfaction, characterizing some of these, such as the repeal of the union, and the conversion of yearly tenants into owners of the soil, as too chimerical to be entertained. Another great subject of controversy, that of the Protestant Church Establishment, Lord Stanley, while admitting its gravity, passed over as one which, in his position, and under the circumstances of the time, it was inexpedient to descant upon. "It is perfectly clear," he said, "that if there is to be any legislation—I don't say that there ought—affecting the political position of the various parties in Ireland, such legislation ought not be the work of a dying Parliament, returned by a constituency which is itself about to be considerably modified." Finally the noble lord concluded his review of Irish affairs by the emphatic declaration, which was frequently referred to in the Parliamentary discussions of the ensuing session, that the condition of Ireland was "the question of the hour." After such a statement from one of the leading members of the Government,

it will not be a matter of surprise to observe how very large a space in the proceedings of the Legislature, and how important a bearing upon the current of political events, and upon the position of statesmen, are to be ascribed to the controversies arising out of the condition of the sister country.

It will be remembered that the Parliamentary Session of 1867-8 commenced in the latter part of the former year, in consequence of the occasion which arose for summoning the Legislature in order to make provision for the expenses of the Abyssinian expedition. The Royal speech, containing the usual programme of the ministerial projects of legislation, was delivered on the 19th November, 1867, and included, among its leading topics, the recent aggression on the Papal territories, and the consequent intervention of France; the "treasonable conspiracy" and outrages of Fenianism; the intended Reform Bills for Ireland and Scotland, with the Boundary Bills for the three kingdoms; the great question of the Education of the People; together with measures for the Prevention of Bribing at Elections, for the better administration of Public Schools, for the amendment of legal procedure, and other matters.

The first question of importance which engaged the attention of Parliament on its re-assembling after the Christmas recess, on the 13th of February, was the renewal of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland. This was the third year in which the condition of the sister kingdom had unhappily rendered necessary the continuance of this restriction on the personal liberty of the subject. Two years before the first Act had been passed, which gave the Lord-Lieutenant the power of imprisoning those whom he had reason to suspect of traitorously conspiring to disturb the peace of the realm. Twelve months later the Government supposed the Fenian conspiracy to be so far crushed that they advised Her Majesty to declare, in her speech from the throne, her hope that exceptional legislation might then be dispensed with. Unhappily the effect of this announcement was to bring back to England the foreign emissaries engaged in fomenting the conspiracy, and again enkindle the spirit of sedition. It became necessary to renew the expiring Act, but the Government were still content to ask a renewal for three months only, and it was not till the session was well advanced, and sedition had developed into rebellion, that the suspension was further extended till the spring of 1868. Again, for the third time, the Secretary for Ireland found it necessary to ask for a suspension of constitutional rights, nor could he now venture to limit his proposal to three or even to six months, but proposed to Parliament to sanction for a whole year, viz. till March 1, 1869, the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. In asking leave to bring in a Bill to this effect on the 14th February, Lord Mayo assured the House of Commons that nothing but a conviction of the absolute necessity for the preservation of peace would have induced the Government to ask for a continuance of these

exceptional powers. In justification of the measure, Lord Mayo stated that though the Fenian leaders had recently transferred the scene of their active operations to this country, there were still events occurring in Ireland which made it necessary that the Government should have this power. They had also information that among the leaders of the conspiracy, both in the United States and on the Continent, considerable activity prevailed. Most of these leaders were men who had been engaged in the American war, and had refused to return to civil life, who had thrown off their allegiance to the British Crown, and carried on their machinations out of the reach of our authority. Explaining the mode in which the Act had been worked, Lord Mayo stated that there were at that time ninety-six persons in custody under the Lord-Lieutenant's warrant, of whom eighty-three were in Mountjoy prison, subject to no other hardship than detention. The number of persons arrested from the 1st of January, 1867, to the 31st of January, 1868, was 265, and of these 111 were arrested in March last, when the short-lived outbreak occurred. The numbers arrested fell away at first after the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act was continued. In July eight were arrested, and during August, September, and October there were only two arrests; but the number subsequently increased, and in the last three months thirty-three arrests were made. Out of the whole number of 265 arrested, ninety-five, including many of the principal persons, had come from America. An observation of at least equal importance might be made on the classification of the persons arrested. They were, almost without exception, persons whose industry was their only wealth—men who might, if they wished, earn a living, and possibly at some time had done so, as clerks, shop-assistants, artisans, and labourers. The agents of sedition were thus those who risked nothing but their liberty in engaging in it, while those who had given any hostages to fortune kept aloof. Among the 265 were ninety artisans, sixty-six labourers, twenty-five professional men and clerks, a certain number of shop-assistants, sailors, and persons of no employment, and only eleven farmers. Lord Mayo called attention to this remarkable abstinence of the occupiers of land—the most numerous industrial class of the community—from participation in Fenian designs. He stated that the Government had invariably been careful to arrest only the leaders, and not to put these powers in force against the mere dupes; and he drew from the statistics of the arrests the conclusion that the movement was confined in Ireland to the very lowest class of the population. To show that these powers—which had been used to suppress no other liberty than that of rebellion—had been efficacious, he read an extract from the *New York People*, and he mentioned that, out of forty-three military leaders sent from America, the three principals had never reached Ireland, and the others had either been brought to justice or were exiles. After repelling indignantly the insinuation that the Government had at one time shut its eyes to

the conspiracy with a view of encouraging it to an open revolt, in which it might be more summarily crushed, Lord Mayo concluded by warmly eulogizing the conduct of all concerned in the maintenance of the law, dwelling particularly on the fidelity and courage of the police.

Mr. Bagwell, while admitting the necessity of the Bill, and that the powers granted to the Government had been exercised with much mildness, expressed his regret that the proposal to renew the suspending Act had not been preceded by some measures of conciliation and relief. He assured the Government that unless they were prepared to deal broadly with the Irish question, they must not expect to continue in office. The Bill was read a first time without further discussion and passed rapidly through its remaining stages in the House of Commons, a few remarks only being offered upon the second reading by Mr. Chichester Fortescue, who, while admitting the impossibility of refusing these exceptional powers, and that the Bill had the acquiescence of all persons in Ireland who had any thing to lose, maintained that its necessity was an evidence of continuous disaffection, and regretted that it had not been preceded or accompanied by some remedial measures.

A discussion of some interest took place in the House of Lords on the 24th of February, when the second reading of the Bill was moved, in the absence of Lord Derby from illness, by the Earl of Malmesbury. That noble lord in so doing expressed a confident opinion that this exceptional and most painful mode of legislation would soon be no longer necessary. His lordship drew a comparison between the Fenian conspiracy, which was joined by none but the lowest of the people, and the great rebellions of '98 and 1803, which were supported by some of the most considerable of the gentry in the sister kingdom. It was plain, therefore, that the great remedial measures which had been passed in the interval of sixty-five years had had their effect in rendering the great mass of the industrious people more peaceable, more contented, and more loyal. He trusted that, though the Government took powers to suspend the Act for another year, long before that time expired they would be able to restore to the people of Ireland the same full measure of liberty as was enjoyed by the rest of Her Majesty's subjects in other parts of the kingdom.

Lord Russell said it was no light thing for the Government to ask leave for the third time to suspend one of the most important liberties of the subject, and to come unprepared with any statement as to how they meant to conciliate the disaffection which undoubtedly largely existed in Ireland. Ireland stood almost alone among modern European countries in its chronic disaffection, and it could not be denied that it laboured under both evils and grievances. Opportunity after opportunity for passing conciliatory measures had been thrown away; but he hoped the present year would not be neglected as its predecessors had been. There was no time like the present for dealing with this question. No man

knew what the future might bring forth, or how our relations with the United States might suddenly become complicated and threatening, and in such an emergency it would be almost impossible to really pacify Ireland. Relief, above all, must be given in the matter of the Irish Protestant Church, which the great mass of the people regarded with aversion and as a badge of conquest. The Irish Church had no parallel in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, or America, and immediate legislation was necessary to remedy this and other grievances of which the Irish people most justly complained.

Lord Hardwicke said Lord Russell had only found out the grievance of the Irish Church now he was in Opposition. With all the opportunities which he had so often enjoyed, how did he account for his inaction in what he considered such a vital matter? He thought there should be perfect equality between the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches in Ireland; but merely to abolish the Irish Church Establishment would be to raise up more enemies in Ireland than the Government had there even now.

Lord Grey could not let the occasion pass without expressing his firm conviction that the day was very distant when Ireland would be as quiet and contented as other parts of the empire. The evils of misgovernment had been too long, too real, and too severely felt to be forgotten at once when justice was administered. Irish nature was human nature, and it could not discard the recollection of its wrongs at the first offer of reconciliation. The real evil lay in the alienation of the minds of the great body of the people from England and from its rule; and in this respect things were daily getting worse instead of better, as was shown by the sympathy evinced for the three murderers whom the Irish called martyrs. To begin with a pacification of Ireland, it was necessary that the Irish Church Establishment should be remodelled. While it remained as it was he had no hope of the quiet or well-being of Ireland. Ireland was supported in its determination to resist this grievance by the opinions of all liberal men, and, indeed, by the opinion of the civilized world.

The Duke of Richmond observed that inasmuch as on the following day the intentions of the Government respecting legislation for Ireland would be made known in the other House of Parliament, it would not be convenient on this occasion to enter upon the subject of Irish grievances. After a few words from the Marquis of Westmeath, who ascribed to a portion of the Roman Catholic priesthood a great part of the evils which afflicted the sister kingdom, Lord Ellenborough expressed his concurrence in Lord Hardwicke's opinion that there ought to be a perfect equality in regard to religion in Ireland. He did not wish to depress the Protestants, but to raise the Roman Catholics. He would not set up one creed on the spoliation of the other, but equality was necessary. It was demanded by justice and dictated by the soundest policy. At the same time it must not be forgotten that

the Protestants were, so to speak, the civil garrison of Ireland, and the Government was bound to that extent to stand by them.

After a few words from the Bishop of Killaloe in vindication of the Established Church, the Bill for suspending the Habeas Corpus was read a second time, and shortly afterwards became law.

The work of the Session had not proceeded far before an important change was announced in the *personnel* of the Administration. The Prime Minister had been prevented by a serious attack of illness from taking his place in the House of Peers at the meeting of Parliament, and the reports which soon after became current of the aggravation of his malady prepared the public mind for the event which followed. On the 26th of February it was announced in both Houses that Lord Derby had felt himself obliged, by the failure of his health, to offer his resignation to the Queen, that it had been accepted by Her Majesty, and that Mr. Disraeli, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had become the head of the Administration. This announcement was made by the Earl of Malmesbury in brief terms, but with expressions of great sorrow and reluctance on the part of his colleagues in yielding to the inevitable necessity. They must hope, said the noble lord, that the rest which the retiring Premier would be enabled to take when out of office would restore him to them in renewed strength, so that they might once more have the advantage of his experience and enjoy the charm of his eloquence. It will be seen that this anticipation was happily realized at a later period of the Session.

Earl Russell warmly expressed his sympathy with the Government on the loss they had sustained. Often as he and his friends on that side of the House had differed, and might now differ on public questions, they could never fail to entertain for Lord Derby those sentiments of regard and esteem which his great qualities were calculated to inspire.

A similar announcement was on the same evening made to the House of Commons, and it was a singular circumstance that in the absence of Mr. Disraeli, whose seat had been vacated by the acceptance of his new office, it fell to Lord Stanley, as the organ of the Government, to communicate the fact of his father's retirement from the Ministry. In few words the noble lord discharged his task, and moved an adjournment of the House for a few days in order to give time for the completion of the Ministerial arrangements.

Mr. Gladstone, after remarking on the singular destiny which had given it to Lord Stanley to make this announcement, expressed the general regret that a career so long, so active, and in many respects so distinguished, should have been brought to a close by bodily illness. He agreed that the adjournment proposed was most appropriate under the circumstances.

The changes in the composition of the Government which followed upon Lord Derby's retirement were as follows:—Mr. Disraeli

vacated the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer, in which he was succeeded by Mr. Ward Hunt; Lord Cairns, previously one of the Lords Justices of the Court of Chancery, became Lord Chancellor in the room of Lord Chelmsford; Mr. Walpole resigned the seat in the Cabinet of which he had previously been a member without office; Mr. Selater-Booth became Financial Secretary to the Treasury in the place of Mr. Ward Hunt, being himself succeeded in the Secretaryship to the Poor Law Board by Sir Michael Hicks Beech. The change thus effected in the composition of the ministry did not carry with it any alteration in the measures or policy of the executive; indeed it was generally understood, before Lord Derby's retirement, that the predominant influence in the Cabinet was that of Mr. Disraeli, and after that event it was equally assumed that so long as the late Premier was able to take part in public affairs his former colleagues would enjoy the benefit of his counsel and co-operation. An occasion was speedily taken by the new Prime Minister of communicating to the supporters of the Government in the House of Commons the views and intentions by which its conduct would in future be governed. A meeting of Conservative members was summoned by circular to the official residence of the First Lord of the Treasury in Downing-street. About 170 noblemen and gentlemen attended, and all the members of the Cabinet, Lord Stanley alone excepted, were present.

Mr. Disraeli opened his address with an expression of regret for the cause of Lord Derby's resignation of the helm of public affairs; but he added a cheering assurance that the Government would still have the benefit of the noble earl's advice. The right hon. gentleman paid a high tribute to the abilities of the chief who had preceded him, and to the services his lordship had rendered to the country. Mr. Disraeli also spoke feelingly of the personal kindness which he had always received at Lord Derby's hands. In succeeding to the post of principal adviser of the Queen, it was most consolatory to himself, and it would be, he knew most satisfactory to those who heard him, that he should still be helped by the wisdom and experience of the noble earl who, he ventured to hope, would soon resume his place in the House of Lords. With respect to the future, Mr. Disraeli observed, the Conservative party must bear in mind that it was in a minority, and that there were difficult and important questions before the country which forbade the expectation of smooth sailing. The right hon. gentleman then referred to some of the leading questions of the day, including the Scotch and Irish Reform Bills and the general state of Ireland. With respect to the subject of Reform, he believed that by the forbearance of parties the Government would be able successfully to carry the Scotch and Irish bills. On the special question of Ireland, and on the points of the Church and land grievances, Mr. Disraeli spoke with caution. Confessing the difficulties in the way of legislation, he said that the Government wished to treat Ireland in a liberal spirit. Without committing himself to any definite policy, he was under-

stood to say that the Earl of Mayo would, in his answer to the motion then impending of Mr. Maguire, make a statement which would, no doubt, be satisfactory to the party, and, he hoped, to the country. Mr. Disraeli, in conclusion, thanked the gentlemen present for the kindness with which they had received him, and expressed a belief that, in the unity of their party, the Conservatives had nothing to fear. He begged to assure them, on his own part, that the Government would, as far as possible, treat on Conservative principles the questions that must still arise. One of those to which he referred was the distribution of seats. The Premier's address was very favourably received by the meeting.

On the two Houses re-assembling after the adjournment, a statement was made by the chief organ of the Government in England as to the course by which its future policy would be guided. Addressing the House of Lords on the 5th of March, the Earl of Salisbury informed them that the formation of the Ministry under its new head was then completed. Two changes only had taken place in the Cabinet. The policy of the Ministry would be the same as that of Lord Derby. The present Session would no doubt be an important one as regarded the measures which would have to be brought forward. The work of Reform would have to be perfected by the introduction of measures for Scotland and Ireland, and a Bill would be introduced for the extension of popular education. An earnest attempt would also be made to remedy the evils which existed in Ireland.

Earl Russell said, "There can be no objection to the new arrangements as to their formal character. It has not been unusual for the leader of the House of Commons to succeed a Prime Minister who has died or retired from office. But, looking to the formation of the new Ministry, I cannot help making that protest which I have made on former occasions as to Lord Derby's Ministry, that I think no confidence can be placed in a Government which openly professes to say one thing and to mean another. That Government was carried on for three years on that principle. Having declared that there should be no reduction in the franchise, yet all the time it was their intention to make a larger reduction than was proposed by their opponents. The consequence has been a course of deception—a course which might be called by another name—which must prevent any reliance being placed on a Government which openly avows that they do not mean what they say."

The Duke of Marlborough was at a loss to understand the meaning of the noble lord. The true state of the case was that the subject of Reform occupied the attention of the Earl of Derby's Cabinet immediately they met. And whatever opinions its members previously held, there could be no doubt that when they decided to propose a measure of Parliamentary Reform they made that proposition in a frank and straightforward manner, and in one entirely consistent with the spirit of the constitution.

Earl Russell said that if the noble duke desired to have his

meaning he would tell him. He had called the course pursued by the Government of Lord Derby one of deception—the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his speech at Edinburgh, called it one of “education” because for seven years the fears of the country had been excited against a reduction of the franchise, against which Mr. Disraeli not only protested in the House of Commons, but congratulated the electors of Buckinghamshire that no such reduction had taken place; and yet during all that time he had, according to his own account, been educating his party to bring about a greater reduction, or, as he then called it, “degradation,” of the franchise than his opponents proposed. It was by those means that many gentlemen were induced to desert their own colours and go over to the Conservative party, believing that there would be no reduction of the franchise. It was by these professions that the Earl of Carnarvon, Lord Cranborne, and General Peel were induced to join Lord Derby’s Cabinet, believing that no such measures would be introduced as were in fact proposed. There was no example in the history of party of such a deception or such an education having taken place. It was a course of conduct that not only men like Charles Fox, Earl Grey, or Lord Althorp would have scorned to adopt, but which would have been equally scorned by Pitt, Lord Liverpool, and the Duke of Wellington. It was a plan and system of Government which destroyed all trust and reliance in public men, because the faith which the Government had pledged one day might be disavowed on the morrow.

On the same evening Mr. Disraeli made a more expanded statement in the House of Commons as to the course which his Administration intended to pursue. He said, “I beg the House to allow me to make a few remarks on the change which has taken place in my relations to this House since I last had the honour to address it. The retirement of Lord Derby was unexpected. I have no language which can describe my sense of his loss, and I will not attempt to dilate upon the career or character of Lord Derby. I think it unnecessary to touch upon his services. It is our pride and boast that he has lived amongst us, and I am happy to be surrounded by many who have a personal recollection of that brilliant perception and that fiery eloquence which he possessed in a greater degree than most men that I have known. Her Majesty has been pleased, on the retirement of Lord Derby, to command me to form a Government. Under any circumstances, I think, there is no one who, when such a trust was pressed upon him, would not feel that in accepting it he must incur a great burden and encounter great difficulties. But I knew that in my position there were personal and peculiar reasons which would aggravate the burden, and which would augment those difficulties. Yet I did not think that I could with self-respect refuse an offer of such a character, and I trusted to be supported by the sympathy of a generous party. And I may be permitted to say that I trusted to receiving fair and impartial

treatment from a House of Parliament in which I have now passed half of my existence. Under these circumstances, I have presumed to undertake the office, and I am bound in gratitude to those who are my colleagues to express my sense of the generous manner in which they have granted me their assistance. Under circumstances of this character, when a new Government is formed, it is not unreasonable that the House of Commons should expect some intimation of the principles upon which the new Administration is to be conducted. I may state that in the present instance my desire will be limited and modified, because it is known, or at least I now declare, that in succeeding to the position of Lord Derby, I have succeeded to that policy which he established when, somewhat less than two years ago, he succeeded to power, and which he has, throughout his administration, more or less advocated. For twenty years I enjoyed his unbroken and unswerving confidence—twenty years that were passed by us in confidential co-operation, absolutely without alloy; and therefore I must be cognizant of the policy of which he approves and of the opinions he will uphold on all the great questions of the day. With regard to our foreign policy, I shall follow the course which has been pursued under the guidance of my noble friend now, Mr. Lord Stanley—I believe I may say with the approbation of Parliament, I think I may add with the confidence of Europe. That policy is the policy of peace; not of "peace at any price," but of peace for the more interests of England, but from the conviction that a policy of peace is for the general interest of the world. We do not believe that that policy is likely to be secured by a selfish isolation on the part of this country, but, on the contrary, by sympathy with other countries, not only with their prosperity, but with their anxieties and troubles. And if such a policy be pursued, I have myself no doubt that when an occasion may arise when the influence of England is necessary to maintain the peace of the world, that influence will not be found inefficient because it is founded upon respect and regard. With regard to our domestic policy, I say at once that the present Administration will pursue a liberal policy. I mean a truly liberal policy. A policy that will not shrink from any changes which are required by the wants of the age that we live in, but will never forget that it is our happy lot to dwell in an ancient and historic country, rich in traditional influences that are the best security for order and liberty and the most valuable element of our national character, and our national strength. Speaking of our domestic policy, I must express the deep mortification which this as well as the late Administration feels that, in one of the most interesting and important portions of the United Kingdom, we are obliged still to retain the suspension of the most important security of the personal liberty of the subject. But I will express the same opinion which Lord Derby expressed when he was at the head of affairs—we look upon the Act not as an Act against the Irish people, but as a means of protecting the Irish people from the machinations of an

unprincipled foreign confederation. And though I do not for a moment pretend to conceal my deep regret at still continuing the suspension of the Act, I think the Parliament and the country and all sides must find great consolation in this result, that in an enlightened age of temperate opinions the suspension of the Habeas Corpus has not been found inconsistent with a just, impartial, and even efficient administration of the law. I trust and believe that the agitations which prevail in Ireland are disappearing, and will soon altogether disappear; and that then the House will proceed to introducing and carrying measures for the amelioration of the condition of the country. I do not doubt that they will proceed with circumspection; and if they proceed with an anxious desire to conciliate the enlightened and temperate opinions of all parties, they will be successful in greatly enhancing the prosperity of the country and the happiness of its people. I will not dwell in detail upon these matters, because the few observations I may make may be misrepresented, and that should be avoided on occasions like the present, and the interest which the House feels upon the subject should not be frittered away. We have now an important debate immediately on hand on the whole condition of Ireland. My noble friend the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant will take occasion in debate to state our general policy with regard to Ireland, and if it is not approved we shall be prepared to vindicate it. It has been stated in my absence, with great justice, that there has been an unfortunate delay in the progress of business. No doubt the occurrence of an autumnal Session, and the unfortunate changes in the Government, have rendered such delay inevitable; but so long as I continue to conduct the business of this House the House may rest assured that there shall be no lack of energy or want of labour on the part of the Government.

Mr. Bouverie made some comments on the address of the Prime Minister, and upon the present position of parties in the House. Mr. Disraeli had spoken of following "the policy of Lord Derby." He should like to be informed what that policy was—whether it was that which he announced two years ago, or that which he followed last year. Mr. Disraeli had fairly earned his position, but at the same time it must be remarked that the Government was too weak in Parliamentary power, and that it had not a majority to carry on the business of the country in the manner in which it ought to be carried on. It was weak in Lord Derby's time; it was made still weaker by his retirement, for he was the keystone of the arch. He did not blame the right hon. gentleman, but members on his own side of the House. The Liberal party did not deserve to be called a party. They had leaders who could not lead, and followers that would not follow.

After some further observations, the House proceeded with the business of the day.

A change in the procedure of the House of Lords which was agreed to early in the present Session is deserving of notice as

a not unimportant step affecting the privileges of that body, which was adopted by its own act, and in concession to the ideas and feelings of the time. A Select Committee of the peers had been appointed to consider the propriety of certain changes designed to carry on the business of the House in a more efficient manner. The most important of these alterations related to the practice of voting by proxy in divisions, which was peculiar to the Upper House of Parliament, and the Report of the Committee on this point was in favour of the discontinuance of the practice.

The Earl of Malmesbury, in moving their Lordships to take the Report of the Committee into consideration, entered at some length into the origin and object of the privilege. "The right," he said, "enjoyed by peers of being represented in that House by proxies when unable to attend personally, was a very ancient and historical one, and it belonged to the estate of the peerage in the same way as the privilege of sending their proxies to the other House belonged to the estate of the Commons. The members of the other House were in reality the proxies of the estate of the Commons. In the primeval days when our Constitution originated the estates of the realm were three, or, as some said, two. First, there was the Church, which was represented by the archbishops and bishops, and next the lay peers. Those two estates, not being very large, could easily meet under the same roof. But of course that was not the case with the Commons, who were too multitudinous to assemble in one place, and they accordingly sent to Parliament their representatives, or, in other words, their proxies. No doubt, then, the committee had seen correctly that it was a privilege of the peers to send their proxies to that House in the same way as the Commons sent the proxies of their estate to the House of Commons. The committee, however, considered whether any change should be made in regard to that practice. There were certain precedents for interference with it, in so far as orders of the House regulating the exercise of the privilege were concerned. When proxies were used in the reign of Charles II., the Duke of Buckingham, who was not very scrupulous, brought more than twenty proxies in his pocket, and an order was made that no peer should bring more than two proxies. The Report of the Select Committee, therefore, said that a peer could hold no more than two proxies, which, moreover, could not be used in committee; and, again, proxies must also be entered by a certain hour of the day. All that showed that the House, by orders of its own, regulated the use of proxies. The inconvenience attending proxies was discussed in the Select Committee; and it was thought that their lordships' House would be more popular, and would enjoy more confidence with the country in respect to its decisions, if that privilege were waived, inasmuch as those who were not present at the debates were not supposed to have a full knowledge of the points on which they would have to vote. On the other hand, there were many members of their lordships' House who,

though prevented from being present by illness or through employment under the Crown, were yet perfectly cognizant of what was going on there, and capable of giving an opinion on subjects brought before Parliament. Such a case it would be easy to find at the present moment in the late Prime Minister (Lord Derby), whom nobody could say was not as capable of giving his opinion on a political question as if he were then sitting in that House. The same remark might apply to some of our Ambassadors at foreign Courts. The committee, however, though divided in opinion, decided that, on the whole, it would be preferable to put an end to the use of proxies, and that an order of the House should be adopted to that effect. They further recommended that, to prevent that order from being lightly suspended, twice the usual length of notice should be given of any motion for its suspension." The noble earl concluded by moving that the recommendation contained in the Report of the Select Committee be agreed to.

The Earl of Carnarvon said that his noble friend had argued in favour of proxies, but had concluded by asking their lordships to vote their abandonment. There would not, he thought, be much difference of opinion among their lordships on this subject. His noble friend said the committee had come to a decision to abandon proxies, because the use of them was not popular out of doors. But his impression was that the feeling of the committee had not so much reference to the question of their being popular or not, as that proxies were a source of weakness rather than strength, and that they were a form of proceeding that could never be used in any circumstances of real difficulty or emergency. It would be as impossible for their lordships to pass any important measure simply and solely by the votes of the absentees as for the lay lords to interfere with the judicial proceedings of that House. That was not a time to lean on fictitious support, and the committee had therefore wisely determined to abolish the use of proxies. The whole character and use of proxies had undergone a great change within the last century. Formerly proxies could not be used except under royal licence, which was granted to peers engaged in the discharge of high and important State duties. Now they did not depend on the royal consent, but were exercised as the privilege of individual peers, who used them as they thought best for their own convenience. The tediousness of communication between the different parts of the kingdom was another ground on which proxies might have been justified in other days. It appeared to him, however, that all the reasons that formerly existed in favour of the use of proxies had disappeared. He should have preferred to see proxies more definitely abandoned, but as, if the present motion was carried, their lordships could never revert to the use of them, he for one should be quite content to accept the motion.

Lord Redesdale said that with respect to proxies, he thought the prejudice against them unreasonable, and that the system was a

more sensible one than that which would necessarily be substituted, viz. pairing. At a later period of the year an announcement was often made that two members of the other House had paired for the remainder of the Session, but in many instances those gentlemen might have voted on the same side. It was surely better for an absent peer to entrust a proxy to a person in whom he reposed confidence, so that his vote might not be lost on any important occasion. Since, however, the majority of the committee, and probably of their lordships, were opposed to the use of proxies, he should not oppose the resolution.

Earl Stanhope gave credit to the noble lord (Redesdale) for consistency, he having both in the committee and on this occasion objected to the discontinuance of proxies. He could not, however, agree with him that pairing was equally open to exception, for there was this important difference, that the addition of a certain number of pairs to both the majority and the minority made no difference in the result, whereas the use of proxies might lead to a decision the reverse of what would otherwise have been given. Indeed, this happened on the last occasion when proxies were used—namely, on the motion of the noble earl (Malmesbury) on the affairs of Denmark and Germany. The majority of the peers present were satisfied with the defence of the Government of the day, but proxies being called for—most unwisely, in his judgment—the majority of the peers absent decided the division against the Government.

Lord Lyveden thought that the abandonment of proxies was a necessary concession to public opinion. After some further discussion the following Standing Order was agreed to:—

“Ordered, that the practice of calling for proxies on a division shall be discontinued, and that two days’ notice be given of any motion for the suspension of this order.”

The discontinuance of proxies was thus placed on the foundation of a Standing Order, which it is at the discretion of the House at any time by its own resolution to suspend. It may be anticipated, however, that the occasion for such a suspension will very rarely, if ever, occur in practice.

Among the earliest measures brought in by the Government was one designed to effect an important practical reform in the administration of criminal justice. The execution of capital sentences in public had for some time past been strongly condemned by public opinion on account of the scandalous and revolting scenes with which these spectacles were attended, the lawlessness and brutality of the crowds which they brought together, and the tendency of the exhibition rather to degrade and harden the minds of the spectators than to produce any ameliorating or deterrent effect. The Report of a Committee of the House of Commons, which investigated this subject, confirmed the prevailing impression of the public mind, and induced the Government to bring in a measure for putting an end to the practice of executing in public. Mr.

Gathorne Hardy, Secretary of State for the Home Department, introduced the Bill for this purpose, and explained the regulations and securities which would be adopted for giving assurance to the public that the sentence had been really carried into effect, a fact of which some thought it would be difficult to afford evidence that would satisfy the incredulous. A few members took exception to the measure, some on the ground of the loss of the deterring force of public example which the existing mode of execution afforded, others from a desire to abolish capital punishment altogether. One of the most earnest opponents of the latter class was Mr. Gilpin, who, on the proposal to commit the Bill, moved, as an amendment—

“That it is expedient that, instead of carrying out the punishment of death in prisons, capital punishment should be abolished.”

He said the question between him and those who were in favour of capital punishment was by what means they should prevent the crime of murder. Whilst other crimes for which capital punishment was formerly administered had decreased, the crime of murder, for which it was still retained, had increased. The first objection he had to this punishment was its essential injustice. He did not hesitate to say that there were many persons walking about red-handed amongst us who had been unquestionably guilty of murder, and who, if the punishment had been short of that of taking life, would have been found guilty and now be in prison. This arose from the unwillingness of jurors to convict. Evidence which would be considered sufficient if the punishment were merely imprisonment was properly regarded as insufficient when it involved the taking of life. Thus the guilty often escaped. On the other hand, it not unfrequently happened that innocent persons were executed, or were in danger of being executed, and of this he gave several instances.

Mr. Gregory opposed the motion. The punishment of death was the great deterrent. Of the eminent men who formed the commission of 1866 only four were in favour of the abolition of capital punishment. The Irish judges were unanimous for the retention of the punishment, as were also the English judges, with the exception of Mr. Justice Shée, and the opinion of all those who were best acquainted with the criminal class was that but for fear of the punishment of death the lives of police-officers would not be safe from them.

Mr. J. S. Mill said it would be a great satisfaction to him if he were able to support this motion, for he always felt reluctance in voting against any measure which was proposed by what were called the philanthropists. He thought, however, that they were mistaken in the present case. When it was shown by clear evidence that a person was guilty of murder with atrocity, it appeared to him that to deprive that criminal of the life which he had forfeited was the most merciful and the most proper course to adopt. It was alleged that capital punishment did not prevent

and Ireland, formed one of the main features in the legislative programme of the Session. In fulfilment of the pledge given by the Government to carry this purpose into execution, the Lord Advocate for Scotland took the earliest opportunity of introducing the measure proposed for that part of the kingdom. In so doing he stated that as regarded the franchise it would be based on the English Act. The borough franchise would be extended to all householders rated and paying rates; and, though he believed the case of lodgers to be amply provided for in Scotland by the present rating laws, there would be no objection to a clause to remove all doubt. In the counties there would be an ownership franchise of 5*l.* clear annual value, and an occupation franchise of 12*l.* There would also be provisions for securing fairness and uniformity of assessment, which the Lord Advocate explained in some detail. Passing to the Distribution clause, he stated that there would be seven new members given to Scotland, which would be an addition to the aggregate numbers of the House. Of these seven, two would be given to the Scotch Universities, one to each of the counties of Ayr, Lanark, and Aberdeen, one to Glasgow to be elected on the "representation of minorities" principle, and one to a group consisting of Ardsassan, Coatbridge, Wishaw, Barrhead, Johnstone, Helensburgh, Kirkintilloch, and Pollockshaw, all in the counties of Lanark, Renfrew, Ayr, and Dumbarton, and containing a population of 74,000. Further than this, it was proposed to add Hawick and Galashiels to the Haddington Burghs, and Alloa to the Stirling Burghs.

Mr. Baxter said if the occupation franchise in Scotland might consist of land only it would be in the power of one or two land-owners in some counties virtually to command the representation of the county. But he still more strongly disapproved of the proposed scheme of distribution. He protested against adding to the number of members of that House. No one would dispute the claims of Scotland to additional representation, but rather than obtain it by that means he would prefer waiting till they could have the question of redistribution as applied to the whole kingdom dealt with by a reformed Parliament. Scotland demanded to be treated as an integral portion of the United Kingdom. They did not ask for additional representation for Scotland *quâ* Scotland, but they asked for a redistribution of the representation of the whole of the kingdom.

Mr. Smollett, though holding that the addition to Scotland ought to be obtained by diminishing the representation of England and Ireland, and favourable to a reduction in the numbers of the House, exhorted the Scotch members to accept the offer now made, on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread.

Mr. Laing argued that the practical question the House would have to decide was—should the numbers of the House be increased, or should the just addition to the representation of Scotland be indefinitely postponed? His experience last year taught him that

it was hopeless to attempt to reopen the redistribution question in this Parliament. He was favourable to accepting this instalment of justice from the Government, and that, he asserted, was the prevailing sentiment in Scotland. Having examined the arguments against an increase of the House, and concluded that there was no force in them, he criticized some of the details of the Bill, and maintained that, on the principles of the Act of last Session, Aberdeen and Dundee were entitled to additional members.

Mr. Moncrieff canvassed closely the distribution scheme, and asserted that the grouping part of it was a mockery, and could never be accepted by the House. He objected, too, to the proposed increase of the House—the legitimate source was the disfranchisement of the small boroughs. The rating principle would create great inconvenience in Scotland; and he suggested its omission from the Bill and the insertion of some provision against the manufacture of fictitious votes. The details of the distribution scheme were also unfavourably criticized by Colonel Sykes and by Mr. McLaren, who characterized the Bill as much worse than that of last year, though he justified an increase in the numbers of the House, asserting that it ought to be to the extent of fifteen at least; and by Sir E. Colebrooke.

Sir James Fergusson replied to objections, dwelling on the difficulties of extending the disfranchisement of English boroughs, and of persuading English members to part with any English seats to Scotland, and exhorting Scotch members not to throw away this chance of obtaining an increase in their numbers. Correcting the statement of the Lord Advocate, he explained that Ardrossan would not form part of the new group, but would be added to the Ayr Burghs; and he defended the creation of new burghs by the importance of conferring the franchise on the working classes there.

Mr. Graham objected to the mode in which the constituency of Glasgow was to be increased, and preferred to divide the city.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer expressed some surprise that Scotch members should talk of opposing a Bill which contained the largest extension of the suffrage ever offered simply on the minor ground of the distribution scheme. The only principle of that part of the Bill was an addition to the representation of Scotland, and the manner in which that addition should be carried out was a matter of detail to be settled in Committee. The Government had no personal interest to serve either one way or the other. The representation of England, he maintained, was not disproportionate to population and property, and he warned the Scotch members that if at any time disfranchisement were carried further in England the seats thus gained would be applied to perfecting the English representation, and would not be handed over to Scotland. Looking to the unwillingness of English members to deprive England of any portion of her representation, it would be wiser for Scotch members to unite in passing a moderate measure

this year than to run after the "jack o' lantern" of what the Reformed Parliament would do for them.

After some further discussion, leave was given to bring in the Bill. The motion for the second reading was strongly opposed by Mr. Hatfield, who moved the postponement for six months. He objected to the proposed increase of the number of the House, and urged that the additional seats required for Scotland should be obtained by the disfranchisement of the small English boroughs. Mr. B. Cochrane also considered the addition of seven Scottish members inadequate, but he dissuaded the representatives of that country from rejecting the Bill.

Mr. Smollett, premising that he accepted the Bill as an inevitable necessity, proceeded to discuss its provisions and the question of Reform generally, in a sarcastic speech. Illustrating his argument by its presumed operation in Glasgow and Edinburgh, he maintained that the Bill would degrade the representation of the great towns, and criticized severely the grouping clauses, which he condemned as clumsy and ignorantly drawn, predicting that the Radical party in Committee would so manipulate them that the Conservative interest in Scotland would not for the future return more than one or two members. After sketching a portentous picture of the House of Commons of the future—a compound of elderly landowners, rich traders, working men, union delegates, and Fenian sympathizers, which would very soon be found amenable to corrupt influences—he wound up by an emphatic declaration that nevertheless he had no fear for the safety and invulnerability of the British Constitution.

Mr. McLaren criticized the details of the Bill with much minuteness, condemning the rating clauses, and showing that they would operate in a disfranchising sense. He urged the necessity of providing against the creation of fagot votes, and, in an elaborate analysis of the population and taxation returns, he sketched a scheme of redistribution which he contended was more consistent with justice to Scotland.

Colonel Sykes, Mr. Graham, and Mr. Crum-Ewing deprecated opposition to the second reading, and in answer to Mr. Moncrieff, Sir James Fergusson, on the part of the Government, said they had never insisted that the additional members should be seven and no more. It would be for members who represented the claims of particular constituencies to make out their case.

Mr. Laing asserted that though the old Whigs opposed the Bill because they thought its defeat would embarrass the Government and retain the Scotch vote on their side at the next election, and though the extreme Radicals, more partisan than national in their feelings, opposed it, desiring to keep the question of redistribution open, yet the real independent and moderate Liberals of Scotland were disposed to accept the Bill on condition that ten additional members should be given to Scotland, that the distribution scheme should be amended, and that the creation of fagot votes should be

prevented. He advised the Government, therefore, to consider, between this and the next stage, the propriety of making these concessions.

These remarks provoked a strong protest from several Scotch members, Mr. Ellice, Mr. Kennard, Mr. Crawford, and others, who maintained that the state of opinion in Scotland bore no resemblance to Mr. Laing's representation of it. The Scotch members, they said, could not be bribed by the proposed increase of the number of members to accept the objectionable features of the Bill. Rather than accept the present scheme as it stood, they would defer the matter till the new Parliament.

The Lord Advocate defended the details of the Bill, and with regard to the number of members remarked, that to give Scotland twenty-five additional members it would be necessary to take thirteen members from England, and twelve from Ireland. As to the grouping, he stated that it was on the same principle as that of 1832.

Mr. Hadfield, in deference to the appeals made to him, having withdrawn his amendment, the Bill was read a second time. In Committee the measure underwent various important modifications, the majority of the House being able to carry several material amendments, to which the Government thought it advisable to accede. The first of these originated with Mr. Baxter, who moved, "That it be an instruction to the committee that, instead of adding to the numbers of the house, they have power to disfranchise boroughs in England having by the census returns of 1861 less than 5000 inhabitants." He said that Scotland was entitled to twenty-five members more than she had, but he would accede to the Government proposal to add only ten, but not thereby to increase the number of members of the House. His proposal was not new. In 1832 Parliament subtracted eight seats from England and gave them to Scotland. There happened to be ten places which could scarcely be dignified by the name of boroughs, they being merely small decaying villages, but each of which returned one member to Parliament. They contained an aggregate population of only 39,704, and the number of electors was 2874, and eight out of the ten places had greatly decreased in numbers in the last five years. He proposed to disfranchise them, and in that manner to obtain the seats required.

Sir Rainald Knightley proposed as an alternative to this motion, that instead of disfranchising boroughs, the Committee have instructions to take one member from each of those boroughs in England which in 1861 had less than 12,000 inhabitants. Sir W. S. Maxwell seconded the amendment. Lord E. Howard pleaded warmly against the disfranchisement of Arundel. To extinguish the small boroughs, he argued, was a step towards the establishment of Electoral Districts.

Mr. Gladstone supported the proposition of Mr. Baxter.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted that Scotland was

entitled to additional representation, but he retained his opinion that the best way of giving it was by increasing the number of members of the House. He had never heard any argument against it. It was said that the numbers were already too great for a deliberative assembly, but what did they mean by a deliberative assembly? It was essentially a representative assembly, and if it were a representative assembly it must be a popular assembly, and it could not be a popular assembly if it were to be restricted in its numbers. He regretted that the House was not disposed to increase its numbers, but as that was so, what they had to do was to bring the question to a conclusion, and to consider what was the best course, and of the two propositions he thought the better one was that of Sir Rainald Knightley.

Upon a division Mr. Baxter's motion was carried by 217 to 196.

Another important amendment, moved by Mr. Bouverie, proposed to get rid of the rate-paying qualification in Scotland altogether by omitting the words making the payment of rates (as in the English Bill) a necessary condition of the franchise. This motion was strongly opposed by the Lord Advocate, but carried against the Government by 118 against 96. The Chancellor of the Exchequer required time to consider the course which the Government should adopt in consequence of this decision. At the next sitting of the Committee, however, the Lord Advocate expressed the intention of acquiescing in the abandonment of the rate-paying clause. The occupation franchise for counties was fixed at 14*l*., the reference to "rateable value" being expunged.

Mr. Disraeli said he would now make another proposition, that seven additional members be given to Scotland, not ten; namely, one member to each of the three counties of Lanark, Ayr, and Aberdeen, one member more to Glasgow, and another to Dundee and two members to the Universities. One member he would obtain by combining the counties of Selkirk and Peebles, which now returned one each, and the remainder he would obtain by applying so far the principle of Mr. Baxter's resolution.

Mr. Baxter declined to accept the Government proposition, and proceeded to move that ten additional members be allocated to Scotland as follows:—two to the Universities, one additional to each of the counties of Ayr, Lanark, and Aberdeen; that Glasgow be divided into two districts, each returning two members; that one additional member be given to each of the cities of Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and Dundee.

Mr. G. Hardy moved as an amendment that three members only be given to Glasgow, which being carried on a division, it was agreed to further amend the clause in accordance with the proposition of Mr. Disraeli. Another question which arose and was discussed at much length was as to the mode of electing the three members for Glasgow. Mr. Graham, one of the representatives of that city, proposed that Glasgow be divided into three districts,

each returning one member. Mr. Disraeli, however, contended that the principle adopted in the English Bill for representation of the minority should be applied to Scotland also. Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, Sir George Grey, and Mr. B. Osborne, opposed the extension of the minority principle, while Mr. J. S. Mill, Mr. B. Hope, Mr. Lowther and other members argued in favour of it. Mr. Graham's amendment was eventually rejected on a division, and the minority principle affirmed by 244 to 185. It remained for the Committee to give effect to the amendment which had been carried by Mr. Baxter for obtaining the additional seven seats granted to Scotland by the disfranchisement of as many English boroughs heretofore returning one member. Sir James Fergusson accordingly proposed, on the part of the Government, a clause providing that the following places in England should cease to return members to Parliament, viz. Arundel, Ashburton, Dartmouth, Honiton, Lyme Regis, Thetford, and Wells. This clause, after some contention as to particular boroughs, was adopted, and the Bill finally passed through Committee. No opposition of any importance was made in the subsequent stages, or in the House of Lords, and the Bill for amending the representation of the people of Scotland in due course became law.

The corresponding measure for Ireland was introduced in the House of Commons by the Earl of Mayo, on the 19th of March. The noble Lord stated that the last Reform Act for Ireland gave an occupation franchise in counties of the value of 12*l.*, and in boroughs of 8*l.*, and the effect of that was to make a large addition to the number of electors. He did not propose to make any alteration in the county franchise; but he proposed to make a considerable reduction with regard to the boroughs. In Ireland the owner and the occupier each paid half the poor-rate, but the owner paid the whole rate of houses under 4*l.* except in five towns, in which the owner paid the whole of the rates of houses under the value of 8*l.* It was proposed to assimilate the law in this respect by enacting that the landlord should pay the poor-rate of all houses below 4*l.*, and to fix the borough franchise at 4*l.* The present number of borough electors was 30,700, and the effect of this proposal would be to add 9813 to the roll. It was also proposed to extend the lodger franchise to Ireland on the same conditions as in England; and that a Boundary Commission should be appointed. There were thirty-three boroughs returning thirty-nine members, containing an aggregate population of 790,000. Of this population the three cities of Dublin, Cork, and Belfast absorbed more than one-half and two-thirds of the valuation. There were no unrepresented towns in Ireland which could fairly lay any claim to additional representation. There were thirty-two counties which returned sixty-four members. The four largest counties, Cork, Tyrone, Down, and Tipperary, had one member for every 156,000 of the population, and 360,000*l.* of valuation; the other twenty-eight counties had one member to every 66,000 of

the population, and 120,000*l.* of valuation; so that there was a great discrepancy, and these four counties had a strong claim to increased representation. This could not be done by taking the second member from any town, nor by grouping, for there were not the elements for a system of grouping in Ireland. It was proposed, therefore, to disfranchise certain boroughs. Downpatrick would be asked to yield its seat to a division of the county of Down; Dungannon its seat in favour of the county of Tyrone. Bandon and Kinsale would be disfranchised, and the seats given to the West Riding of the county of Cork. Then Cashel would be disfranchised in favour of the northern division of the county of Tipperary. It was also proposed to disfranchise Portarlington, and to give a third member to Dublin. In this scheme he could not be charged with party motives, as it so happened that three members who would lose their seats sat on one side of the house, and three on the other.

A brief discussion took place at this stage of the measure in which some of the representatives of Ireland took part.

Mr. Brady complained that no reduction was made in the county franchise, and demanded vote by ballot for the Irish tenants; Mr. Bagwell objected to the elimination of the urban representation, and pointed out that the change was in favour of the territorial influence; Mr. Lawson denied that the largest counties had been fairly chosen for increased representation, and asked why the third member was not given to the counties, as well as to Dublin city, on the minority principle. Mr. Reardon also made some remarks in condemnation of the Bill, and Mr. O'Beirne complained of the attack on his borough (Cashel) in violation of the principle of the English and Scotch Bills that no place should be disfranchised.

Mr. Gladstone, admitting that there were one or two good principles in the Bill, reserved his opinion on the details until the plan was in print. But he regretted that the Government had not seen their way to a larger increase of the Irish constituency, and pointed out that the merging of boroughs into counties would make it more difficult to retain the county franchise at its present figure.

Leave was then given to bring in the Bill. It was read a second time, with very little discussion, on the 7th of May, though some members expressed dissatisfaction with the redistribution of seats which was proposed. On the House going into Committee, which did not take place till the 15th of June, the same objections were taken to the arrangements for altering the seats. Ultimately, Mr. Disraeli expressed his regret that the redistribution scheme had met with so little favour on either side of the House, and stated that he was prepared to withdraw that part of the Bill. The Gordian knot having been thus cut, the further progress of the measure was much facilitated.

Mr. C. Fortescue moved a clause to the effect that in all future

Parliaments the University of Dublin and the Queen's University in Ireland should jointly return two members, and that all doctors of law and medicine, masters of arts and masters of surgery, bachelors of law and of medicine of two years' standing, and all bachelors of arts of three years' standing, upon whom degrees had been or should be conferred by the Senate of the Queen's University for the time being, should, if of full age and not subject to any legal incapacity, be entitled to vote in the election of members to serve in Parliament for the said Universities.

The Earl of Mayo, in opposing the motion, said the scheme of redistribution had been abandoned by general consent, and this amendment would set aside that understanding. But the governing body of Trinity College had authorized him to state that they would agree to insert a clause in the Registration Bill, binding them to give the electoral franchise to every master of arts on taking his degree without payment of the additional fee.

Mr. Gregory said that the Irish Secretary's speech was the most miserable exhibition of political pusillanimity which had ever emanated from a Cabinet Minister, and denounced the authorities of Trinity College as a narrow-minded and intolerant corporation, which had invariably opposed every concession to religious liberty.

The clause was negatived on a division by 183 to 173. An attempt was then made by Sir Colman O'Loughlen to abolish the right of voting by freemen, subject to a reservation of existing rights.

This proposition gave rise to an animated debate, in which the arguments on either side were a reproduction of those used when a similar clause was proposed in the English Bill of the preceding year. Mr. Gladstone earnestly supported the clause, while Mr. Henley made an elaborate vindication of the claims and merits of the class which it was proposed to disfranchise. A division resulted in a majority of 155 to 109 against the amendment. The sharpest struggle took place on an amendment moved by Colonel French to reduce the county franchise from 12*l.* to 8*l.* rateable value. In support of his motion Colonel French entered into a long statement of the rating arrangements in Ireland, to show that the reduction proposed by him would almost equalize the county franchise in the three kingdoms.

Lord Mayo, in objecting to the amendment, dwelt on the fact that the Government scheme of Reform placed the county franchise on the same footing in all the three kingdoms, though Ireland had anticipated England and Scotland by some years in adopting the figure of 12*l.* There was nothing, he urged, in the circumstances of Ireland to justify this further reduction, for it was absolutely certain that in a very short time there must be an alteration in the system of valuation in Ireland which would completely assimilate the basis of valuation in all the three countries. The proportion of the number of county voters to the population by the Bill would be about the same in Ireland as in England and Scotland.

Mr. Osborne, designating the Bill as an *ignis fatuus* and a farce, made light of this or any other reduction of the county franchise, unless accompanied by the protection of the ballot. Between the landlord and the priest, the franchise would be a curse to the tenant without a lease.

Mr. Gregory took much the same view of the effect of the amendment. It would not strengthen public opinion, but would hand over the counties more completely to the influence of a certain number of great landlords.

Mr. Gladstone dwelt on the importance of observing a certain proportion in the Reform arrangements for the three countries, and argued that, if this Bill passed in its present form, the franchise, both in town and country, would be left at a higher point in Ireland than in the other two countries. In fact, a Bill of so limited a scope, adding only 9000 to the borough voters, could not be said to dispose of the subject of Irish Reform. Lord Mayo's assumption that an assimilation of the county franchise would be speedily brought about by a revision of the Irish system of valuation he treated as completely illusory, and he reminded the House that in 1850 it had accepted an 8% franchise for Ireland with the approval of Sir R. Peel.

Lord John Brown suggested as a compromise that a 10% franchise should be adopted. Mr. O'Reilly and Mr. Synan supported the amendment.

On a division the amendment was rejected in favour of the Government proposal by 241 to 205.

Sir John Gray then moved a clause to the effect that votes at elections in Ireland should be taken by ballot. This was also rejected by a majority of ninety-nine, and the Bill passed through Committee. Upon the consideration of the report some strong observations were made by Irish members on the inadequate and illusory character of the Bill as it then stood, denuded of those provisions by which the representation might have been amended, and the basis of the franchise enlarged.

Mr. O'Beirne expressed his dissatisfaction with the Bill. First, he thought the borough franchise was fixed at an unfair figure, and one that would not satisfy the Irish people. Next, the free-man franchise was left untouched. Lastly, the county franchise was not reduced below the figure at which it was placed eighteen years ago, when the English county franchise was more than six times that amount. The late Mr. Hume had said that an 8% county rating in Ireland was equal to a 30% county rating in England, and the late Sir James Graham had expressed his opinion that the basis of the county franchise in Ireland ought to be largely extended. Why should a stigma be cast on the Irish farmers by the presumption that they were not as competent to exercise the franchise as the farmers of West Kent? By this Bill 9000 would be added to the total number of voters in Ireland, while by the English Reform Act of last Session a number equal to one-

tenth of the whole of the present voters would be added to the English constituencies. The number which ought to be added to the Irish constituencies, if the English system were acted on in respect to Ireland, was 20,000; while if the Legislature were governed merely by considerations of population the addition would be 500,000. He refused, and believed the Irish people would refuse, to accept this as any thing like an adequate measure of Reform for Ireland; indeed, he would have infinitely preferred having had no Irish Reform Bill introduced at all during the present Session. In conclusion, he expressed a sincere hope that at the coming general election the people of Ireland would unanimously declare that they would no longer submit to a system of legislation which was unequal in its character and unjust to their interests.

Mr. Bagwell remarked that this was a very small and a very ridiculous measure. Hon. gentlemen on that side of the House had consented to the distribution of seats being relegated to the next Parliament, but they certainly hoped that a more extended county franchise would be at once adopted. The Irish members had just reason to complain of being basely abandoned by the English and Scotch members on that side of the House, whom they had, at the cost of much time and trouble, assisted in carrying the English and Scotch Bills. Nothing more futile than the Bill now under consideration had ever been proposed by any Ministry, and he, in common he believed with all the Irish Liberal members, entered his emphatic protest against it.

Sir Colman O'Loughlen quite concurred in the remarks of the last speaker. A majority of the Irish members were in favour of extending the suffrage in the counties, and of abolishing the free-man franchise, but the motions introduced to carry out those objects were lost in consequence of the apathy of the English members, who had neglected to come to the House to support them.

Sir J. Gray believed that no Irish member on the Liberal side of the House was satisfied with the Bill, which both as to boroughs and counties did less for Ireland than the English Bill did for England, considering the comparative circumstances of the two countries, and that a 12*l.* county rental in Ireland was equivalent to a 30*l.* rental in England. The county of Clare had 20,300 electors forty years ago, and now it had 3400; and now fewer electors were added to the whole of Ireland than were formerly deducted from the constituency of this one county.

Mr. Esmonde did not regard the Bill as in any way a settlement of the question, which was sure to be reopened at the earliest opportunity.

A clause was subsequently moved by Mr. Reardon to reduce the county franchise to 6*l.*, and the borough franchise to 3*l.*, but it was rejected without a division. The same fate befell some other amendments from either side of the House, and the Bill having

been read a third time *sub silentio*, passed through the House of Commons.

Arriving in the House of Lords at a late period of the Session, the Bill was accepted in the shape in which it came up, though not without some strong remarks on its inadequate and defective character, but it was regarded as affording the only chance of dealing with the subject in the present Session, and therefore adopted in preference to leaving the question altogether unsettled.

The Marquis of Clanricarde said that, as a measure of Parliamentary Reform, the Bill was a mockery and an absurdity. What was required in Ireland was not so much an extension of the franchise as a redistribution of seats. Anomalies existed in Ireland which could not be justified on any ground, and it was precisely because there was so much to be done in that direction that no attempt at redistribution had been made. It was evident that another Irish Reform Bill would have to be introduced next year. This measure conferred the franchise on the most doubtful class to which it could be extended in Ireland. He would not detain their lordships by going into statistics on this subject further than to refer to one or two facts which would be found in a paper laid upon the table of the other House of Parliament, showing the population and the number of the electors in the different counties and boroughs in Ireland. It was evident from this paper that there were very striking anomalies in connexion with the representation of Ireland. There were eighteen boroughs, the largest of which, Lisburn, had only 302 electors; of which one, Portarlington, had only ninety-two electors, and most of which had under 200 electors, and yet each of those boroughs returned a member; while an important county containing 1000 electors, and having within it no boroughs, returned only two members. Again, it was impossible that the populous, wealthy and increasing district to the south-east of the city of Dublin could remain without direct representation and the ninety-two electors of Portarlington continue to return a member. He had no intention of opposing this Bill, but he protested against the notion that it was a measure which would settle the question of Reform in Ireland, because he foresaw that, within a year or two, it would be necessary to take up the question of the redistribution of the representation in that country.

The Earl of Longford reminded the House that this was not the Bill originally introduced by the Government. By the Bill as at first proposed certain small boroughs in Ireland would have been abolished, and among them Portarlington, whose member would have been given to the city of Dublin. That Bill, however, met with so small an amount of favour in the House of Commons that the Government were obliged to give up that scheme of redistribution. Though in the Bill before their lordships the qualification in boroughs was named at 4*l.*, practically the borough franchise in Ireland would be the same as that in England, as in the former country premises valued at under 4*l.* were exempted from payment

of rates. There was a lodger franchise for Ireland, as well as for England and Scotland.

Earl Russell was disposed to accept this Bill as it stood, because, notwithstanding the anomalies in the Irish representation pointed out by the Marquis of Clanricarde, he thought the measure was sufficient for the present time. His reason for saying this was that he thought it could not be said that the Irish boroughs generally had more than a fair proportion of representation. It therefore seemed to him that it would be better for Parliament to wait for some years and see whether there were not some large and increasing towns, such as Belfast, entitled to additional representation. With regard to a "hard and fast line," which was so strongly repudiated by the Government last year, he might observe that in England and Scotland we had it in respect of the county and the lodger franchises, and in Ireland it was now to be extended even to the boroughs. He was led to the conclusion, therefore, that either the pretence put forward last year was a false one, which he thought it was, or that the Government had departed from their own principles.

The Earl of Bandon said that the large county of Cork, in which he resided, contained no less than 15,995 voters, who only returned two members, while four boroughs in the same county had a collective constituency of only 814 voters, who returned four members to the House of Commons. Even under the present Bill the whole constituency of these boroughs would not exceed 1760, and, probably, would not yield more than 1300 or 1400 voters. The Irish Reform Bill of 1850 had, unfortunately, given up the principle that the county franchise should be based upon property, and he still retained the opinion which he expressed at the time that this was a step in the direction of equal electoral divisions. He looked upon the lodger franchise as applied to Ireland with considerable distrust, for he could not forget that before the Bill of 1850 the great complaint was the swearing on both sides as to the value of the holdings. He trusted that at some future time a Bill for the redistribution of seats in Ireland would be brought before their lordships' House.

The Bill was then passed.

In addition to the Scotch and Irish Reform Bills thus brought to a conclusion there was another measure which it was necessary to pass before a general election under the new law could take place, viz. a Bill for defining the boundaries of boroughs in England. Some necessary steps had been taken for this purpose in the preceding Session. By a Bill then passed certain persons therein named had been appointed Commissioners for ascertaining boundaries, and their duties prescribed and defined. These gentlemen having, with the aid of a number of Assistant Commissioners, made the necessary inquiries in the autumn of 1867, presented their Report to Parliament. It was generally admitted that they had exercised their powers with perfect impartiality and fidelity,

but some of their recommendations had for various reasons proved unpalatable to the boroughs to be affected by them. In some cases the objectors were influenced by the fear of a possible liability to increased local rates, in others they were animated by a feeling of jealousy towards the districts proposed to be annexed, and in certain instances both parties, as well as those who were to be added as the constituency to which the addition was to be made, concurred in opposing the annexation. Several of the boroughs in consequence presented petitions to Parliament, praying that the recommendations of the Commissioners might not be confirmed, and instructed their representatives to oppose their passing into a law. A notice of motion was given by Mr. Hibbert on the House of Commons going into Committee on the Boundary Bill for postponing the consideration of the scheme so far as related to the old boroughs. On this occasion a long and rather desultory discussion arose, commenced by Mr. Gladstone, who, in entering upon the subject, disclaimed all intention of casting reflection upon the Commissioners, to whose judicious and impartial discharge of their duties he paid a high compliment, but pointed out one or two difficulties in which the House was now involved from the limited nature of their instructions. Though strongly prejudiced himself in favour of making parliamentary and municipal boundaries continuous, it was too late now to urge that arrangement; but he insisted that the disposition of the parties—of the town to be extended and the district to be annexed—ought to be taken into consideration, and the Commission had no power given them to inquire into that element. In many cases extension of boundaries would be disfranchisement, as it would deprive men of the middle classes living outside, and having their places of business inside a town, of the county vote they enjoyed, and another objection to extension would arise from the abolition of compounding. Wherever a decided unwillingness or a divided state of opinion existed, he maintained that it ought not to be overridden without examination; but there was this difficulty, that the Bill to be of use must be passed by the 10th of June, which, if each town was to be discussed *seriatim*, would be impossible. Under these circumstances, therefore, if placed between the alternative of passing the Bill as it stood without listening to any complaints, and of accepting the amendment of Mr. Hibbert to postpone the cases of the old boroughs, he should support the latter. But a third course, he suggested, might be struck out, by which the old boroughs which did not object might not be deprived of the benefit of an extension of their boundaries. The House might either postpone the cases of those boroughs which had signified their objections to the Commissioners' Report, or refer the schedule to a Select Committee. He pressed the Government to consent to some arrangement of the kind, protesting that he had no desire to retard the progress of the Bill, or to treat the question in a party spirit.

Mr. Disraeli acknowledged that the Bill involved numerous

difficulties; but expressed a confident belief that with temper and patience a satisfactory settlement of them all was possible. Recalling the circumstances under which the Commission was appointed, and reminding the House that it was virtually a Parliamentary Commission, he pointed out that to interfere seriously with their labours would be to make it impossible again to obtain the services of eminent men for a similar task. He did not deny, however, that their report was subject to revision, and if, as the Committee went on, such cases arose, they could be dealt with on their own merits. If it seemed desirable, they might be referred to a Select Committee, or the memorials might be referred back to the Commissioners, or some other mode of facilitating the progress of the Bill might be hit upon. This was not strictly a Government measure, for the Government had acted entirely as the trustee of Parliament in the matter, and it ought not to excite any kind of party feeling. The Government certainly would not deal with it in that spirit, and would leave their supporters entirely free. Indeed, no one could foretell how it would affect party interests. It was desirable that the Bill should be passed by June 10, but if it were not, a short Bill would be necessary to facilitate the Dissolution.

Mr. Hibbert explained that the motive of his amendment was not to deprive the boroughs which were satisfied with the Commissioners' Report of an immediate extension of their boundaries, but to give time for a consideration of the cases of those boroughs which had complained of the proposed boundaries. This could hardly be done adequately this year under the necessity of passing the Bill before the 10th of June. It was for the Government to suggest some arrangement for this purpose, and unless this were done he should persevere with his amendment.

Mr. Goldney reminded the House that the effect of postponement in the case of the Municipal Boundaries Commission, thirty-four years ago, was that nothing had been done from that time to this.

Mr. Bass pointed out that of eighty-one boroughs the boundaries of which were altered, only fifteen had any substantial complaint to make, and he suggested that the Government should refer these fifteen to a Select Committee.

Mr. Hardy believed that there were not more than seven boroughs in which any serious difficulty would arise, and the House of Commons was perfectly competent to deal with these without the aid of a Select Committee. At least, the House ought to try before resorting to that expedient.

Sir George Grey thought that a larger number of controverted cases would be found to exist; but he advocated the referring of the subject to a Select Committee.

Mr. Bright, Mr. Roebuck, and Mr. Monk concurred in this suggestion.

Mr. Russell Gurney, who had been one of the Commissioners

under the Act of the last Session, explained the spirit in which the Commissioners had endeavoured to carry out the instructions of Parliament, and pointed out, in answer to the remarks of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright, that the extension of borough boundaries was not a mere transfer of voters from county to borough constituencies, for thousands of men would have no votes unless these boundaries were extended. Speaking for those of the Commissioners whom he had been able to consult, he stated that they fully admitted the right of Parliament to alter any of their recommendations, and that they would not feel aggrieved by that course. But they probably would object to having the matter referred back to them, as Mr. Disraeli had proposed. On all accounts the reference ought to be to another tribunal, but he warned the House against entering into a general inquiry, and as the Report had been three months before the country, it ought to be limited to those boroughs from which petitions had already been presented.

Sir F. Crossley, who also had acted as a Commissioner, concurred entirely in Mr. Gurney's statement.

Mr. Disraeli expressed his readiness to consent to a Select Committee of five members, on these conditions:—that it should be appointed by the Committee of Selection; that it should sit from day to day; that its inquiries should be limited to boroughs from which petitions had been presented; that the evidence should be entirely documentary; and that it should have power to consult with the Commissioners.

In the course of a desultory discussion which ensued, Mr. Gladstone and other members urged that not only towns which had petitioned Parliament, but those which had presented memorials to the Commissioners, and on whose behalf notices of motion had been given by their representatives, should be considered by the Select Committee. Ultimately Mr. Hardy consented to include the last class of boroughs, and that the Committee should have power to contract boundaries.

A few days later the subject was resumed, and Mr. G. Hardy moved that a Select Committee be appointed to consider the boundaries of the boroughs which had petitioned, thirty-three in number.

It was resolved that the Committee should sit *de die in diem*, and consist of five members—viz. Mr. Walpole, Sir W. S. Maxwell, Mr. Whitbread, Mr. A. Bruce, and Mr. K. Hodgson.

On the 29th of May Mr. Walpole brought up the Report of the Committee thus appointed, and described the result of their labours as follows:—The boroughs had been divided into three classes. The first class comprised boroughs in regard to which the Report of the Commissioners had been recommended for adoption. They were the following:—Bolton, Chester, Greenwich, Newport (Monmouthshire), Northampton, Preston, Stalybridge, and Windsor. The second class comprised boroughs with respect to which slight modifications had been made. They were as follows:—Chelsea,

Darlington, Middlesborough, Newport (Isle of Wight), Salisbury, Wilton, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Hastings, and Oldham. The third class comprised boroughs the present boundaries of which were recommended to be retained—namely, Birkenhead, Birmingham, Bristol, Gateshead, Lambeth, Liverpool, Marylebone, Manchester, Nottingham, Portsmouth, Reading, South Shields, Tyne-mouth, Warwick, and Wigan.

A Bill was then brought in for the purpose of confirming the Report of the Boundary Commissioners, subject to the alterations recommended by the Select Committee. The proceedings on this Bill re-opened the controversy, Mr. Gorst having cast some reflection on the motives which actuated members of the Committee.

Mr. Walpole (Chairman of the Committee) defended their impartiality, and said they had to deal with two classes of boroughs, the old and the new. As to the new there was no dispute; and of the old only thirty-three were referred to them. As to eighteen of these the Committee either agreed with the Commissioners or made such modifications of their recommendations that there was no substantial difference between them. Consequently, the whole controversy now related to fifteen of the cases referred to the Committee, and upon which they thought that no alteration should be made in existing boundaries. Mr. Walpole then explained the principle by which the Committee had been guided in their proceedings, and spoke strongly in support of their recommendations. Had not the Commissioners' Report been challenged he should have been prepared to say, "Accept it as the best decision to be arrived at," but, when once it had been challenged, and the House itself said that the matter must be referred to a Select Committee, if, then, the Committee did not exercise its judgment, it would be such a gross neglect of duty that he would never consent to be a party to it. If the House did not accept the Report of the Committee, all he could say was that they had lost a good deal of time.

Mr. Stopford made objections to the mode in which the Committee had conducted the inquiry, and urged the House to recur to the recommendations of the Commissioners.

Mr. Bright was entirely satisfied with the proceedings of the Committee and with the rules on which they had acted, and urged the House to accept their report, which was perfectly satisfactory to all concerned. The House, he maintained, by its original appointment of a Commission, had declared itself unfit to go into the details of this matter, and the Government, when the Committee was formed, announced that their report was to be final. This last statement, however, was disputed by Mr. Hardy.

Mr. Newdegate said that the House could not abdicate its right to review the decisions of the Committee. He argued that the recommendations of the Commissioners were to be preferred.

Mr. Disraeli denied that the Government had pledged itself to be bound by the Report of the Committee. His recommendation

now was that the House should go on with the Bill without further loss of time, and, trusting to the practical good sense which had so often been shown, he anticipated that all the difficulties of the schedules, which were not numerous, would soon be satisfactorily disposed of.

Mr. Gladstone reminded the House that the Select Committee was a tribunal of review, with better means of information, and with larger powers of judgment than the Commission. The Government had thrown over the Committee, but he hoped the House would not give its sanction to such a proceeding.

Mr. Hibbert moved an amendment in the Bill, the effect of which was to substitute the boundaries of the old boroughs, according to the recommendations of the Select Committee, for those which had been proposed by the Commissioners.

Mr. Adderley opposed the amendment, and insisted on accepting the boundaries recommended by the Commissioners. He illustrated his argument by referring to Birmingham, which had been extended beyond its boundaries into the rural districts. He said that if Birmingham were not made conterminous with the town population, thousands of persons would be disfranchised.

Mr. Bright objected to adding the suburbs of Birmingham, with upwards of 35,000 inhabitants, to an already overgrown community of 350,000, as only increasing existing inequalities. He observed that it was part of a policy borrowed by Mr. Disraeli from Lord Bolingbroke to give the landed interest an unassailable power in Parliament, which, if it were successful, must lead to electoral districts. To draw a sharp line between urban and rural districts would ultimately damage the Conservatives most of all; but he predicted that no ingenuity would be able to extract a party advantage from this Bill.

Mr. R. Gurney (one of the Royal Commissioners) stated the grounds upon which he and his colleagues had arrived at the conclusions in their report, and argued against what he termed "a wholesale disagreement with their decision." Their instructions were said to have been imperfect, but they were given them not merely by the House of Commons, but by Parliament; and it was on the faith of those instructions and the principles laid down for regulating the boundaries of boroughs that the Reform Act of last year had been agreed to. The Commissioners understood that members were to be elected for the towns of Birmingham, Manchester, and other places, and not for portions of them, and that was the principle on which they had acted. If it were not carried into effect whole districts would be excluded altogether from the franchise.

Mr. H. A. Bruce spoke on behalf of the Committee, and, refusing to shelter himself under the plea that the difference between the two authorities was owing to the variance in their instructions, freely criticized the Commissioners' Report, and pointed out various instances in which he asserted they had gone on an entirely wrong principle.

The amendment was supported by Sir H. Williamson and Mr. Osborne, and opposed by Mr. D. Bromley, Mr. Newdegate, Lord Galway, and Mr. A. Peel. Eventually it was carried on a division by 184 to 148. The success of this amendment secured the passing of the Bill. Other amendments hostile to the recommendations of the Select Committee were moved and rejected, and the Bill finally passed through Committee in a shape by which the fifteen large boroughs, about which the controversy had been raised, were retained in the position recommended by the Select Committee.

The differences which had excited a considerable amount of party feeling in the House of Commons were revived with even greater animation when the Bill came before the House of Lords. The question was again raised as to the conduct of Government in attempting to set aside the recommendations of the Select Committee, to which it was alleged they had agreed to refer the settlement of boundaries by way of compromise. Earl Beauchamp having moved an amendment with respect to the Parliamentary limits of Birkenhead and Birmingham in accordance with the original report of the Boundary Commissioners, Earl Granville earnestly protested against this course, and appealed to the Government to withhold their support from the amendment, on the ground that Mr. Disraeli in the House of Commons had assented to the alterations suggested by the Select Committee as a compromise.

The Earl of Malmesbury observed that it was not in the power of any Ministry to control the action of the House of Lords by speeches delivered in the House of Commons.

This remark drew from Earl Russell the rejoinder that the Prime Minister had distinctly declared after the Bill assumed its present shape that the question of boundaries was settled. It would, therefore, he submitted, be a breach of faith on the part of the Government now to disturb that settlement.

The Lord Chancellor denied that Ministers were bound to accept the report of the Select Committee.

After some further discussion, Earl Granville and the principal members of the opposition party rose from their seats and simultaneously left the house.

The Duke of Marlborough emphatically declared that such a step on the part of those noble lords was unwarrantable and an insult to the House. Earl Beauchamp warmly disclaimed any intention of taking the house by surprise.

On the following day the Earl of Malmesbury referred to the scene which took place on the previous evening, when Earl Russell, Earl Granville, and other leading members of the Liberal party walked out of the house. He said that such a scene had never occurred within his memory, and it was entirely without excuse. If the noble lords believed that Government was deceiving the House they ought to have taken a different course. In order, however, to leave no pretence for such a charge, Government were

willing to postpone the Boundary Bill and the Scotch Reform Bill, and to request the independent members of the House not to press their amendments.

Earl Russell defended the conduct of himself and his friends, which he held was justified by the unusual course pursued by the Government, who might, if so minded, have proposed an adjournment, in order that the statement of the First Minister as to the sense in which he had accepted the amendment made by the Commons in the Boundary Bill might be explained.

The Duke of Montrose (who had given notice of an amendment with respect to the boundaries of Glasgow) remarked that he would never have put it on the paper if he had thought it could be regarded in the light of a breach of faith.

The Marquis of Salisbury recommended, for the dignity of the House, to let the matter rest.

The Lord Chancellor said a retraction of the charge against the Government should first be made.

Earl Granville said the course adopted by himself and his noble friends was not disrespectful to the House. The course was no doubt unusual, but its justification was shown by the fact that it had been successful. It was, moreover, the course adopted by the Government themselves, who frequently, during the Session, had walked out of the House of Commons in a body before a division, to avoid committing themselves on the eve of a general election.

The Duke of Argyll said he had from the first suspected that Government intended to move amendments which he had determined to protest against as a breach of faith.

The Earl of Derby said the discussion had been conducted with unnecessary warmth, and although the Prime Minister's statement respecting the Boundary Bill was open to some doubt, it was just as reasonable to conclude that he had committed their lordships to the Irish Church Bill because Ministers had permitted it to go through its later stages in the Commons without opposition. After the explanation of the Government he thought that noble lords were bound to express their regret at what had occurred, instead of continuing the unworthy course of imputing motives.

The Earl of Harrowby attributed the original breach of faith to the Liberal party in the Commons, who, being dissatisfied with the conclusions of an impartial Commission, insisted on referring the Bill to a Select Committee, thus making it a question of party and local politics.

Eventually the Bill passed through the House of Lords in the same shape in which it had been sent up from the Commons.

Another measure which had been announced by the Government as necessary to complete the legislation connected with Parliamentary Reform was directed to the amendment of the law relating to Election petitions and the more effectual prevention of bribery and

corruption. This very difficult subject, which the House of Commons had for many years past vainly endeavoured to grapple with, had been remitted in the preceding Session to a Select Committee of that House, whose inquiries had resulted in a recommendation which, if adopted, involved a material change in the law and practice of Parliament. The measure proposed was the abdication by the House of Commons of the privilege hitherto tenaciously adhered to, of exclusive jurisdiction as to the elections of its own members. This indeed had been regarded by many generations of statesmen as an indispensable privilege of an independent legislature, and in all the changes which had taken place in the mode of exercising the jurisdiction in question the right itself had been jealously guarded and insisted upon. At length, however, the opinion which had for some time been gaining strength prevailed, that the competency and impartiality of the tribunal was even of higher importance than the conservation of a constitutional principle which the great change in the balance of political power in modern times had reduced almost to a nominal value. Experience had proved that the Election Committees did not satisfactorily fulfil the office either of detecting electoral corruption or of determining the rights of conflicting claimants to a seat. They were neither wholly exempt from the suspicion of partiality according as the composition of the particular tribunal might impress it with a party bias, nor even if they escaped such imputation were they considered to possess the judicial attributes which might qualify them to ascertain the truth and enforce the penalties of the law upon the offender.

Impressed with this conviction, the Select Committee, which included several leading members of the House of Commons, arrived at the conclusion that the time had come when, in order to grapple effectually with the hitherto irrepressible vice of electoral corruption, the jurisdiction of the House as to the elections of its own members should cease and determine. In resolving, however, to part with this power the Committee pronounced in decided terms that there was one condition upon which alone they would consent to the abolition of the privilege, namely, that the jurisdiction should be transferred to no judicial body except to the highest known to the Constitution, the judges of the superior Courts at Westminster. It was recommended that every case of a controverted election should be tried before a single judge, having the absolute decision both of law and fact, with power to report not only as to the seat but as to the existence of bribery or corruption at the election, with which the House might afterwards deal in the exercise of its powers as it should see fit.

The reform thus proposed in the election tribunal appeared likely to meet with no unfavourable reception either in the House of Commons itself or with the public, but an obstacle arose to the execution of the plan which at first seemed likely to be of a formidable character. The judges, upon being consulted, with one voice

condemned the proposal, and declared that the fulfilment by them of such a function would be inconsistent with their other duties and would, in consequence of the peculiar character of the inquiries and the strong feelings excited by them, not improbably involve discredit to their judicial character. The Lord Chief Justice addressed to the Lord Chancellor a letter, which was made public, in which these objections were urged in forcible terms. Remonstrances coming from such a quarter naturally produced much effect upon the minds of the Government, who recoiled from imposing on the chief magistrates of the realm a duty they were so unwilling to assume, and which they so strongly deprecated on public grounds. In deference to these objections it was determined to propose to the House of Commons a modification of the scheme of the Select Committee, substituting for the superior judges a Court consisting of three persons to be specially appointed for the trial of petitions, to whose jurisdiction it was proposed also to annex some other functions of a cognate kind. In propounding this measure to the House, Mr. Disraeli did not conceal his own reluctance to surrender the original scheme proposed by the Committee, explaining that he did so with some disappointment, but in deference to scruples to which the Government felt bound to defer. The alternative plan was not received with favour by the House. The objection to create a special tribunal for a jurisdiction so limited and occasional as the trial of Election petitions which rarely occur in any number except in the first Session after a General Election was forcibly urged, and it was still more strongly insisted upon that to none less than the highest judicial power in the country ought the House of Commons to consent to transfer its constitutional privilege. With regard to the validity of the objections raised by the judges some differences of opinion were expressed.

Mr. Lowe said he was disposed to resent the protest of the judges, and to doubt that they had any more right than other public servants to refuse duties imposed on them by Parliament.

Lord Cranborne defended the conduct of the judges in this matter as eminently wise and patriotic, and argued that as most of them had been active party men, and might still be supposed to retain party predilections, to throw these semi-political duties upon them would be to weaken the unlimited confidence at present reposed in them.

Sir R. Palmer said the judges had done no more than their duty in protesting against this semi-political function, if they believed that it would weaken public confidence in their administration of the law. Moreover, as election committees usually came together after a general election, it would be necessary to have four or five new judges to try them with necessary expedition. The general business of the country did not need such an increase.

Mr. Gladstone pointed out two considerations in favour of a transference of jurisdiction—one, that committees could only deal with the questions between the two candidates, and could not enter

on a general examination of the manner in which the electoral franchise had been exercised in a particular borough; the other, that by the present system the immense advantages of a local inquiry were sacrificed. To the principle of a transference of jurisdiction he did not object, but it must be to the superior judges. The question he held to be—would the House give this power to the highest authorities of the law, or retain it in its own hands? The defects of the present system would be raised to a maximum by the creation of an inferior tribunal.

Mr. Bright denied that the case was so desperate as to require the House to give up this important privilege. But for the prevention of bribery he preferred to trust rather to the inevitable enlargement of constituencies and the adoption of the ballot.

Upon the whole the tone of the debate on this first promulgation of the measure was adverse to its adoption, nor did its reception out of doors indicate the satisfaction of the public. It did not, therefore, create any surprise when Mr. Disraeli, in moving the second reading of the Bill, frankly admitted that he thought the objections made to the projected tribunal were well founded; he therefore now proposed to substitute another plan, viz., that two judges of one of the superior courts of law at Westminster should be appointed, with the same salary that they had when judges, and that they should investigate petitions on controverted elections on the spot; that on their appointment to this office they should cease to be ordinary judges, but that they should become members of the Privy Council, and form part of the Judicial Committee, and also be required to sit in the Exchequer Chamber, or such other appeal court of an analogous character as might hereafter be appointed. He thought that by this means they would obviate the objections of the Lord Chief Justice to these duties being thrown upon the judges.

Mr. Gladstone thought this tribunal an improvement on that first proposed. At the same time it was a tribunal of a novel character, involving many points for consideration, and he did not preclude himself from objecting to it hereafter.

On the order of the day for going into Committee on the Bill Mr. Mitchell moved an amendment which put in issue the expediency of transferring the jurisdiction over Election petitions to an exterior tribunal. The amendment was as follows:—"That while the House earnestly desires to provide the best tribunal for the trial of controverted elections, and to ensure the detection and punishment of bribery and corruption, it is not prepared to assent to any measure which aims at the destruction of its ancient privilege to hold in its own hands the power of determining who are its members." He said this Bill would place the House of Commons under the power of a judge appointed by the Crown. The tribunal ought to consist of one member from each side of the House, with a legal assessor, and their report to the House should be acted upon if not questioned within a certain time.

The resolution underwent much discussion, but was ultimately rejected without a division. Mr. J. S. Mill, in commenting upon the principle of the Bill, observed, "there was some reason in the objection against turning the jurisdiction of the House over to a judge appointed by the Crown; but one way of getting over this would be to make the Act temporary."

Upon a further amendment being moved, which again raised the question of the removal of the trial of petitions from Parliament to a Court of Law, a division took place, when the principle of the Bill was affirmed by 178 to 158. Another proposition, modifying, to a large extent, the scheme proposed by the Bill, was started by Mr. Bouverie. He moved to substitute clauses providing that Election Committees should consist of five members; that three additional common law judges should be appointed, one of whom should sit as President of Election Committees, and decide all questions of law that might arise, and certify to the Speaker the decision of the Committee, who should, in fact, sit as a jury to hear the merits of the petition. He urged the impolicy of establishing a foreign tribunal to judge the conduct of members, and said the House should not part with its ancient jurisdiction.

This proposition did not meet with any considerable support, and was negatived by a large majority, on a division. The question being again raised as to the mode of constituting the new tribunal, Mr. Lowe recommended that three new judges should be added to the judicial staff in Westminster Hall to discharge precisely the same description of duties as their fellows now do in the different courts, the whole body of judges to arrange among themselves the rotation in which they should perform their functions.

Some further discussion ensued, in the course of which the propriety of appointing judges at all was canvassed with considerable animation.

Mr. Disraeli then proposed a new modification of his measure, to the effect that the trial of Election petitions should be conducted by a single judge to be selected from a rota which should be formed by arrangement among the judges of the three superior courts. The right honourable gentleman also announced that in order to make the new system experimental only, he should propose to limit the duration of the Bill to three years. The Committee agreed to these proposals, but they rejected, by a considerable majority, a clause originated by the Government, for authorizing an extra allowance of 500*l.* to the judges placed upon the rota for Election petitions. A variety of other amendments were proposed and discussed during the sittings of the Committee, which occupied many days during the last few weeks of the Session. Several of these amendments related to the expenses of the elections, and those attending the trials of the Election petitions, which it was proposed to throw in whole or in part upon the constituencies themselves, but they were ultimately negatived by the Committee. Mr. Clay renewed an attempt, often

made before without success, to prevent the commission of bribery by making the renunciation of corrupt practices obligatory on the consciences of the members elected. He moved a clause requiring every person returned to Parliament to make at the table a solemn declaration that he had not bribed, and would not directly or indirectly do so, and rendering him liable to a penalty of 500*l.* and parliamentary disability should it be proved that he had made a false declaration. His object, he said, was to make it impossible for the man who was corruptly returned to hold up his head again in society, that he might be black-balled at clubs, and that his acquaintances might lament the misfortune of having been intimate with him.

Sir Colman O'Loughlen opposed the clause. They had recently got rid of promissory oaths, so that if they were to sanction this clause they would be retrograding with regard to the principle of oaths and declarations. When men had to swear to a qualification they did not hesitate to do so.

The Solicitor-General also opposed the clause on the ground that such a declaration whenever tried had been always found to be useless.

The Committee rejected the clause by a majority of 85 to 45.

The provisions of the Bill, originally proposed for England only, having been made applicable to Ireland and Scotland, it was read a third time, and sent to the House of Lords just before the expiration of the Session. On the second reading being moved by the Earl of Malmesbury, Earl Russell regretted that the Bill had not come before the house at an earlier period, in order to introduce some material amendments. He believed investigation on the spot would not only be economical but would have a powerful effect in checking corrupt practices; he doubted, however, the policy of calling upon the judges to decide questions which must often be mixed up with political passions and party warfare. But, as the Bill was avowedly only an experiment for a limited period, their lordships would do well to agree to it.

A short discussion followed, in which the Lord Chancellor and Lords Romilly, Harrowby, and Stratford de Redcliffe took part, and the Bill was read a second time, and having passed through Committee without amendment, received the Royal Assent on the last day of the Session.

In consequence of the occurrence of circumstances having an important bearing on the relations of parties in the House of Commons, and which will be related hereafter, it was mutually agreed that arrangements should be made whereby the Elections under the new law might take place in the ensuing autumn, so that the new Parliament might be enabled to hold a short session before the expiration of the year. In order to give effect to this design it was necessary that the proceedings required to be taken for the revision of the Electoral Lists should be accelerated and brought to a close at an earlier period than was

practicable under the existing law. The Government accordingly undertook to bring in a measure for this purpose, and Mr. Hardy, the Home Secretary, fulfilled the pledge by introducing in the second week in June, a Bill to amend the Law of Registration so far as related to the year 1868. Describing the various stages of registration up to the time of completing the lists at the beginning of September, he stated that the Government had decided that none of the preliminary processes of making claims, objections, and the like could be advantageously or safely abbreviated. The process of shortening would be limited to the revision, and the Bill proposed that both for towns and counties the revision should commence in September. Three weeks would be allowed for it, and the Vacation Judge in chambers would be empowered to supply additional revising barristers as they might be required, to the amount of one-third more than the present number. To obviate the delay which might happen from the necessity of numbering the lists from one end to the other it was proposed that they should be numbered by parishes or polling districts, so that the printing might go on simultaneously, and might be finished within two or three days after the revision—about the last day of October. He also proposed that the interval between the proclamation and the return of the writs should be shortened from thirty-five to twenty-eight days; the result of which would be to get the new Parliament together by the 8th or 9th of December. The House desired to come to a decision whether certain principles were to prevail in the government of the country; and by the arrangement he proposed this decision could be taken in time for members to get home again by Christmas. He pleaded, too, that the Ministers—whoever they might be—ought to have an interval of six or seven weeks to prepare their measures for the following Session. To the objection that no time would be allowed for the registration appeals, he replied that under the existing law, even when a vote was appealed against, the name was placed on the list, and the vote was valid at the election.

Mr. Gladstone acknowledged that the plan had been conceived with an earnest desire not unduly to contract the preliminary stages of registration (which would be dangerous) and to secure an early Dissolution. He agreed, too, that to select the stages of revision for the shortening process was wise, and he promised to assist in facilitating the progress of the Bill.

Having been read a second time, the measure underwent the revision of a Select Committee, and being found well adapted to carry out the object in view, it was passed with general concurrence in both Houses.

CHAPTER III.

AFFAIRS OF IRELAND—The state of that part of the kingdom forms the most prominent topic of the Session—The great question of disestablishing the Irish Church—Important interests dependent on that controversy—Attempts by Mr. Pim and the Marquis of Clanricarde to legislate on the subject of Land Tenure—Abortive result of these measures—*The Ecclesiastical Titles Act*—Earl Stanhope moves for a Select Committee upon the operation of this measure—Discussion thereon in the House of Lords—A Committee is appointed—In the House of Commons Mr. Maguire raises a general discussion upon the condition of Ireland by a formal motion—His speech—The Earl of Mayo in answer reviews at great length the circumstances of the country, and explains the remedial measures, both ecclesiastical and civil, intended to be proposed by the Government—Prolonged and important debate on the programme of the Ministers—Speeches of leading members on either side of the House—Mr. Gladstone announces in emphatic terms his policy of disestablishing the Protestant Church—Sensation excited by this statement—Reply of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—Mr. Maguire, in consequence of the declaration made by the leader of the Opposition, withdraws his motion—Mr. Gladstone lays on the table three Resolutions relative to the disconnexion of the Established Church of Ireland from the State—Lord Stanley gives notice of an Amendment, asserting that the question ought to be reserved for the New Parliament—The debate commences on March 30th, and is continued for several nights—Speeches of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Stanley, and of the leading members on both sides—Mr. Gathorne Hardy in an emphatic speech pledges himself to the conservation of the Protestant Church—Upon a division Lord Stanley's Amendment is negatived by a majority of sixty—Great excitement in the House at the announcement of this majority—Upon a second division the motion to go into Committee on the Resolutions is carried by 328 against 272—Parliament adjourns for the Easter Recess—Great interest manifested by the public in the Irish Church question—Public meetings on both sides—Earl Russell addresses a large gathering of the supporters of Disestablishment at St. James's Hall—Rival meeting of the Conservatives at the same place, and speech of the chairman—After the Easter Recess the subject is resumed in Parliament—The Earl of Derby originates a debate in the House of Lords on the proposed policy of Mr. Gladstone—Answer of Earl Russell, and speeches of other Peers.

THE great conflict of the political campaign of 1868 revolved, as it had done in some preceding Sessions within the memory of the present generation, upon the affairs of Ireland. From the meeting of Parliament to its prorogation, the condition of the sister kingdom and its institutions were made the point of contention between opposing parties, and the pivot on which turned the fate of Cabinets. The present year, however, was distinguished by even keener and more excited conflicts upon the principles of Irish administration, and a deeper commotion of the elements of religious and political warfare than had been evoked since the crisis of the Papal aggression, or the more distant date of the famous Appropriation Clause. It may, indeed, almost be said that the entire political interest of the present Session was concentrated on the question of the Irish Church, and as soon as the existence of the Parliament came to an end, the scene of the controversy was merely shifted, and the issue transferred from the benches of the House of Commons to the hustings of the three

kingdoms. The question whether the Established Church of Ireland should be maintained in connexion with the State, or should be "disestablished," was the test by which candidates in all parts of the United Kingdom were judged by the constituencies. Other measures for the improvement of Ireland were for the present postponed, in order to give free scope for the decision of this great controversy. The question of land tenure, which for so many years past had formed the subject of legislative experiments, was not indeed entirely neglected, two attempts having been made, though with but faint efforts or prospects of success, to re-adjust the relations of landlord and tenant. In the first week of the Session Mr. Pim, one of the members for Dublin, obtained leave to bring in a Bill which he described as substantially the same as that introduced in 1866 by Mr. C. Fortescue. Its first object was to give to limited owners who wished to improve their property the power of charging a portion of the expense on their successors. Its second object was to give to the limited owner power within certain limits to make contracts as to time. The third object was, in the absence of any specific contract, that the tenant should be secured compensation for the improvements he had effected; and the fourth to abolish the power of distress.

The measure thus introduced, however, was not further proceeded with, and the same fate befell a Bill brought in shortly afterwards by the Marquis of Clanricarde, the object of which the noble lord stated to be to secure to tenants a fair remuneration for their improvements. This Bill, after some further discussion, was referred to a Select Committee, Lord St. Leonards having first expressed a strong opinion that there was no necessity for it. He thought that fair leases ought to be granted to occupiers in order to give them an interest in the improvement of their holdings.

Another movement was made in regard to the Ecclesiastical Titles Act passed in 1850, for the purpose of protesting against and repelling what was then designated as the "Papal aggression." This Act had in fact never been put in force, but it was alleged that the enactment of it had occasioned great irritation in the minds of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and that its retention in the Statute-book was felt as a standing grievance by members of that communion.

With the view of inquiring as to the existence of this feeling, and removing, if possible, any just cause of offence, Earl Stanhope moved for the appointment of a Select Committee "to inquire into the operation of any law as to the assumption of ecclesiastical titles in Great Britain and Ireland, and whether any and what alteration should be made therein." He reminded the House that in 1850 the Pope had thought proper to alter the system by which he had up to that time regulated his spiritual authority in this kingdom, by conferring territorial titles on the dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church in England. This created much excitement throughout the country, and the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, which imposed heavy penalties on the illegal assumption of

ecclesiastical titles, was passed. But no attempt had ever been made to enforce the penalties, and nothing could be worse than the systematic violation of the law on the one hand, and the systematic connivance at that violation on the other. He objected to the Act on that ground, and also because it had a painful effect on the people of Ireland.

Lord Redesdale said the Act was a protest, not so much against the assumption of ecclesiastical titles as against the power of conferring them by a foreign prelate. The change in the government of the Roman Catholic Church in England, by giving territorial titles to her bishops, was made for the purpose of aggression, and the Government had acted rightly in meeting that aggression. It was scarcely worth while to take steps to enforce the penalties, but the Act itself was most valuable as a protest.

The Duke of Somerset did not think much advantage would be derived from a Committee. He was still of opinion that the act of the Pope in conferring ecclesiastical titles upon Roman Catholic prelates in this country was an outrage upon the Queen and the liberties of the country.

The Marquis of Clanricarde said the Act was a grievance to the Roman Catholic prelates, and ought to be repealed; but he doubted the expediency of appointing a Committee when the matter was pending before the other House of Parliament.

Earl Grey said the Bill before the House of Commons repealed the Act; but it was necessary to go a step further, and to declare the effect which the Act had produced.

The Lord Chancellor thought a case had been made out for the appointment of a Committee. Those who regarded the Act as a protest must now admit that it was a protest made in a most inconvenient form, and causing most undesirable consequences.

The Earl of Malmesbury, on the part of the Government, assented to the appointment of a Committee, which was nominated accordingly, and entered upon an inquiry in which much evidence was taken. The Committee made their report before the termination of the Session, but did not recommend the repeal of the Act.

The initiatory step in the great contest on Irish affairs, which became the most prominent feature of the Session, was taken by Mr. Maguire, one of the members for Cork, who, on the 16th of March, proposed a motion on the state of the sister kingdom for the consideration of the House of Commons. The hon. member began his speech by observing that it was idle to deny that the condition of Ireland was such as to cause anxiety and alarm. The country was now occupied by an army, men-of-war were in her harbours, and gunboats on her inland waters, while armed cruisers guarded her shores from Transatlantic invaders. The boasted liberty of the British subject was suspended, and the liberty of individuals depended upon the whisper of a spy, the suspicion of a policeman, the swearing of a perjurer, or the folly or stupidity of an official of the Crown. The recollection of the penal laws

embittered the spirit of men whose fathers suffered from them. Wise legislation should be directed towards effacing those sad pages of a nation's history, and happy would be the statesman who could succeed in accomplishing that object. He held that England was bound either to pursue a just and enlightened policy towards Ireland, or to allow her to govern herself. The Act of Union with England was carried against the declared wishes of the Irish people; and the fact that but 5000 persons petitioned the Imperial Parliament for Union, and that 700,000 petitioned against it, was of itself strong corroboration of the fraud, violence, and corruption by which that measure was carried. The chief causes of discontent in Ireland were the land grievance and the existence of the Established Church. Until the tenant got security for his improvements, and was protected from the rapacity or caprice of his landlord, it would be vain to hope for tranquillity. He asked the Government to declare what measure they had in contemplation to remedy this crying evil, and he warned them that the country would not be put off or satisfied with another royal commission. Having referred to the Irish exodus, and to the consequences of planting across the Atlantic millions of implacable enemies to British rule and power, Mr. Maguire went on to refer to the Irish Church, which he described as a scandal and a monstrous anomaly, which Englishmen, if applied to themselves, would not tolerate for a single hour. In advocating, as a Catholic, the disendowment and disestablishment of that Church, he repudiated on the part of his co-religionists any desire to participate in the spoil of the Establishment. The Catholic bishops and clergy had declared over and over again that they would not touch a farthing of the funds of the Established Church, although derived from lands once the property of Catholic owners. The objection of the majority of the people of Ireland to the State Church was that it offended the religious sentiment of the country. It was the badge of conquest and degradation. The Catholic manhood of the nation was arrayed against it, and the whole population demanded its abolition on the broad ground of justice and common sense. The Catholic clergy of Ireland would not accept any payment from the State, for they well knew if they were once to accept it, they would lose all spiritual influence over their flocks, and eventually become either the spies or the stipendiaries of the State. Among the panaceas proposed for Ireland were a royal residence and the purchase of the railways. He would be glad to see a palace for the Sovereign raised in Ireland; but that would not be sufficient to remove discontent, nor would cheap locomotion effect that object. But, if the State could buy up the railways, why, he asked, could it not deal with the much larger question involved in the settlement of the relations between landlords and tenants? He called upon those who were responsible for the integrity of the United Kingdom to deal with the Irish difficulty in a comprehensive and patriotic spirit. If they would do this they would conciliate all

classes of the people, extirpate Fenianism, and lay the foundation of a state of things which would redeem a nation and save an empire. In conclusion, he moved that the House should at once resolve itself into a committee with the view of taking into immediate consideration the condition of Ireland.

Various amendments were moved by Mr. Neate, Sir F. Heygate, and Lord A. Clinton, but did not obtain any support. The Earl of Mayo then rose to state on behalf of the Government the view which they took of the condition of Ireland, and the policy by which they proposed to deal with it, not denying that much disaffection and even disloyalty existed in that country. He argued, however, that those feelings were confined to a much lower class than had been known in similar periods of discontent. The Fenian movement, he said, had produced no men of station and intellect like the Fitzgeralds and Emmets of '98, or even like the Mitchells and Duffys of '48. The whole of the landed gentry—Roman Catholic and Protestant—all the classes largely interested in trade, and the professional classes, were the most strenuous opponents of Fenianism. It was only among the smaller occupiers of land, agricultural labourers, and the artisans of large towns that it had any root. The real force of the movement lay in the United States, and if the connexion with the United States could be cut off for a few months the conspiracy would speedily collapse, for though there were large bodies of Irishmen in Australia and Canada, Fenianism was entirely unknown there. Lord Mayo dealt next with various mis-statements made both at home and abroad as a sort of excuse for the disaffection which prevailed; and, first, to the assertion that Ireland was an oppressed country, mis-ruled by Englishmen for their own benefit, he replied that if Ireland was tyrannized over, the tyrants were Irishmen, and he showed that the whole of the executive—the bench, the municipal authorities, and the constabulary—were Irish, and that a more exclusively national Government was impossible. To the assertion that the land of Ireland had at one time belonged to the peasantry he replied that at every successive confiscation the ancient possessors of land had invariably emigrated, and that none of their descendants were left in the country. Finally, he combatted at considerable length—quoting numerous statistics—the statement that Ireland is a decaying country, and showed that during the present generation there had been a great increase in the acreage under cultivation (from 13,000,000 to 15,400,000), in the value of live stock (from 21,000,000*l.* in 1841 to 50,500,000*l.* in 1866), and in other agricultural produce. There had been a steady rise in rents and in the rate of wages; the roads had been greatly improved; railway communication had been extended; and more than 18,000,000*l.* had been advanced from the Treasury for improvement purposes. As further tests of the improving condition of the country he cited the increase of the consumption of beer and spirits, and of the deposits in the Joint-Stock Banks, and laid con-

siderable stress on the general diminution of crime and pauperism, and on the large extension of education. The increase of tonnage in the Irish ports had been greater than in any other part of the United Kingdom, and, from his own experience, he disputed Mr. Maguire's assertion that the country towns of Ireland were decaying. He canvassed next the various plans put forward—especially those of Mr. Bright, Mr. Mill, and Sir John Gray—for the creation of a peasant proprietary, denying first of all, from the experience of French, Swiss, and other Continental communities, that this would be a Conservative class imbued with any particular respect for the rights of property. If the agricultural classes of Ireland had been deeply tainted with disaffection, he would admit the necessity of a strong remedy, but this he disproved by applying the tests of emigration, agrarian crime, and the records of Fenianism. Only two and a half per cent. of the emigration had been contributed by the agricultural classes; agrarian crime had sunk from 1000 cases in 1844 to eighty-seven in 1866, and of the 1100 men arrested under the suspension of the Habeas Corpus only twenty-four got their living by the land. All these plans for the creation of a peasant proprietary would lead to the old system of subdivision from which the country had formerly suffered so deeply. Passing on to the policy of the future, Lord Mayo, after discussing briefly the provisions of last year's measure, intimated that he would shortly bring in a Bill which, besides providing an easy means of securing compensation for improvements, would increase the leasing powers of limited owners, and would contain provisions for the encouragement of written contracts. This last announcement was received with considerable cheering from both sides, but a further statement that it was proposed to institute a solemn inquiry into the relations of landlord and tenant provoked some derision from the Opposition benches. Lord Mayo, however, justified the project by the ignorance and misconceptions which prevailed, and he asserted that without fuller information the question never could be completely or satisfactorily settled. In addition to this, he would on an early day bring in the Irish Reform Bill, and he hoped soon (for the Commission to which the subject had been referred was expected to report before Easter) to submit a measure for the more efficient management of the Irish Railways. The question of education was next touched on; and, first, as to primary education, Lord Mayo said it had been referred to a Royal Commission, which probably would speedily be able to suggest modifications of the present system, removing objections, and setting the controversy at rest for ever. As to the University question, it was not intended to disturb the existing arrangements of Trinity College or the Queen's University; but as neither of these institutions commended themselves to the great mass of Irish Roman Catholics, it was proposed to confer a Charter on a new Catholic University, the organization of which he explained at length.

Parliament would be called on to furnish an endowment for this University, but for the present no endowment would be asked for Colleges in connexion with it. Finally, Lord Mayo dealt with the Irish Church question, which he reminded the House was now being inquired into by a Commission appointed at the instance of Lord Russell. That Commission would probably report in the course of this Session, and the Government, therefore, held it to be impolitic to deal with this question immediately. That there was any pressing haste he denied, for if the Church were overthrown to-morrow there would not be a Fenian the less, nor had any body yet suggested a feasible mode of disposing of the revenues. But neither on this nor on the land question could a satisfactory settlement be obtained by confiscation. Policy and justice might demand the equalization of Church establishments in Ireland, and Protestants were not disinclined to consider any fair proposal for that purpose. But it must be done by the process of levelling upwards not downwards; the destruction of the Irish Church would not conciliate one enemy, while it would alienate many friends. Lord Mayo concluded by impressing on the House the gravity of the occasion, with an emphatic warning against rash and precipitate measures.

The debate, having been adjourned, was continued for three nights afterwards, most of the leading members in the House taking part in the discussion. Our limits will not allow of more than a brief summary of those speeches which represented in the most striking form the sentiments of the various sections of the House.

Mr. Horsman expressed his thorough disappointment with the Irish policy of the Government, which on the Church question was inaction, on the land question procrastination, and on education retrogression. But though they were to do very little they were to inquire into a great deal—in fact, they had put the whole of Ireland into commission. Dealing first with the proposal to establish a Catholic University, he strongly denounced it as a project originally conceived in avowed opposition to the Queen's Universities, and for the propagation of Ultramontane doctrines both in religion and politics. As to the Church of Ireland, so long as it was maintained as a favoured Church, there would be no peace in Ireland, and it ought therefore to be swept away. It had passed beyond the stage of inquiry. It could not be shelved for another year, as the Government proposed, but Parliament ought at once to lay down the principle on which the ecclesiastical arrangements of Ireland should be continued for the future. Passing to the land question, he traced the evils of the present system to the time when Ireland was governed by corruption, and when the enormous multiplication of small holdings, each giving a vote, gave a larger market value to an estate than the highest cultivation. Looking to the different circumstances of England and Ireland, the doctrine that the same principles of legislation were applicable to both countries was

utterly fallacious, and for the future our legislation ought to be in accordance with the wishes and wants of the Irish people without asking whether it would be applicable to England. Never could we rule Ireland without coercion until we had given full effect to the principle of religious equality, until we had removed in some way or other the feeling of insecurity which was driving the tenant farmers from the country, and had united all classes in one great system of unsectarian education.

Mr. Lowe maintained that in discussing the Irish question Fenianism should be left out of sight. It was an incidental circumstance of the present condition of Ireland arising altogether out of the close of the American war, and fed entirely from extraneous sources, and it was ridiculous to assert that it had any connexion with the land or the Church questions. The aim of the Fenians was plunder and confiscation; they came, not to attack the British Government, but to desolate Ireland, and the existence of this conspiracy ought not to force us into any extraordinary or revolutionary measures. Feeling impatient, he said, as an Englishman, of perpetual misrepresentations on this question, he proceeded to show the fallacies on which most of them rested. Though there was much that was unsatisfactory in the state of Ireland, she, nevertheless, as Lord Mayo had shown authoritatively, was progressing, and in some respects rapidly. Ireland was no more governed by England than England by Ireland. She was adequately represented in Parliament, her taxation was lighter, and she received such large assistance from the public funds that England might complain of being overtaxed for her benefit. As to the land question it was absurd to inveigh against the law, which was the same in England and Ireland, and, though he had sat on many committees, he had never heard yet a case of landlord oppression which could be verified by dates or other circumstantial evidence. The system of small holdings was at the root of Irish ills, and while it prevailed to its present extent there must always be chronic poverty and discontent. The only remedy was to provide employment for the people besides agricultural labour. That could only be done by the flow of capital into Ireland. If capital did not find its way there it was the fault, not of Parliament, but of the friends of Ireland, like Mr. Maguire, who were perpetually crying out that the country was in decay and threatening agitation. But it was this system of small holdings which Mr. Mill proposed to stereotype. Mr. Lowe made a lively and humorous attack on the pamphlet recently published by Mr. Mill, and contended that it would aggravate all the evils of the present state of Ireland. The British Government, besides being a heavy loser in point of money, would become ten times more odious, by being placed in the position of landlord, and the peasantry would be inspired with a burning desire to get rid of us, that they might have no more rent to pay. The holding of land was regulated, not by laws, but by the condition of every country; and even if Mr. Mill's plan were

adopted, the process of aggregation would soon recommence, or else the old evils of sub-letting and overcrowding would recur. Turning to the proposal to create a Roman Catholic University, he condemned it unreservedly as a concession, not to the Roman Catholic laity, but to the Ultramontane hierarchy of Ireland. Far from being a sedative, nothing was more likely to do mischief. But he refused to believe that the Government was in earnest in this proposal; it was rather a pyrotechnic device which would sink into oblivion when it had served its purpose. Otherwise, it would not have been broached first to Parliament, and without previous communication with the Roman Catholic Bishops. He deeply regretted the determination not to touch the Irish Church. The revenues of the Church he held to be public property, of which Parliament was the trustee for the benefit of the Irish people at large; and it was a scandalous misappropriation to devote them exclusively to the religion of less than ten per cent. of the population. It was the last link of a galling fetter, and when we had swept it away we might boast that we had broken entirely with the wicked past.

Mr. Mill was not much surprised that nothing was to be done on the land question, for he allowed that the time was far distant when what he should consider a real remedial measure would be proposed by a Government. But he specially regretted the determination not to deal with the State Church,—an anomaly which was condemned by the whole human race, and which no people would submit to but at the point of the sword. The plan of endowing the Roman Catholic clergy Mr. Mill, retorting the taunt of Utopianism which had been levelled at him, characterized as “kakotopian”—too bad to be put into practice. The clergy themselves certainly would not accept our bribe. The state of Ireland, he maintained, was more dangerous than it had ever been at any previous time, and the circumstance that it received its strongest support from abroad was the most dangerous feature. Admitting that since 1829 we had ceased to govern Ireland for our own benefit, and had only been guilty of not knowing how to carry out our good intentions, he traced the course of legislation since that year, pointing out our numerous mistakes. But the great reason of our failure was our unwillingness to face the large and bold measures which alone could cure Ireland. Mr. Mill defended at length, and with great elaboration, his pamphlet, which he said had been greatly misrepresented, and complained particularly of the epithet “confiscation.” His object was to promote security of tenure, which was the great want of Ireland, and he suggested that the Commission to be appointed should inquire how far the principle of his plan with modification, to which he was not adverse, could be applied in practice.

Mr. Hardy denied that Mr. Mill's plan, if it were put in practice, would have any effect in removing Irish disaffection, and he pointed out that the landed Estates Court already gave facilities for the

purchase of land in small lots. After protesting warmly against the vague and exaggerated language of Mr. Maguire and Mr. Horsman, and repeating some of the facts stated by Lord Mayo to show that Ireland was progressing and that Fenianism derived its strength from external sources, he proceeded to defend the Government programme. The mixed system of education, he asserted, had become gradually almost entirely denominational, and the same feeling which had brought about this change existed with regard to University education. The Roman Catholics of Ireland, as a rule, had not sent their sons either to Trinity College or the Queen's Colleges, and from that he assumed that they desired a University of their own. Indeed they had founded and endowed one, and this was the justification of the Government in proposing to create a new University which would not be a merely clerical establishment. As to the Irish Church, he pointed out that the Commission had been appointed at the instance of Lord Russell, and he demanded that those who pressed for immediate disestablishment should first show what they would do with the revenues when they had got it. In illustrating this he read a long extract from a speech of Mr. Gladstone, who in 1865 resisted a motion of Mr. Dillwyn on the ground that its acceptance would make it necessary for the Government to come forward with a plan. Mr. Gladstone then said, "The whole question is, What is your remedy?" and that was now the difficulty. With respect to many subjects it was necessary for those who were charged with the responsibilities of Government to give up some of their most cherished predilections; but to consent to a resolution for the immediate disestablishment of the Church would be an unparalleled act of political cowardice, which, so far from conciliating the Irish people, would be but the signal for fresh demands. At present, therefore, the Government were not prepared to make any proposal on the Church question, and seeing that Lord Russell during the years he had been in office had always declined to deal with it, he held it to be highly unreasonable that the present Ministry, which was new in office, should be compelled to pronounce on it at a moment's notice.

Mr. C. Fortescue, admitting the general accuracy of Lord Mayo's representation of the condition of Ireland, pointed out that the progress which he had proved had not been achieved by inaction or by coercion. Enumerating the numerous legislative and administrative reforms passed for Ireland during the last forty years, he complained that the Government had made no vigorous attempt to pursue that policy. On the wisdom of creating a Catholic University he remarked that, though a strong friend to mixed education, he did not regard it as a religion to be forced upon the world on every occasion *vi et armis*; and therefore, though this proposal carried the denominational principle further than any Government had attempted to carry it before, and though it would be an insuperable bar to the opening of Dublin University to all

denominations, if it were accepted by the Roman Catholics he should not object to it. On the land question he remarked that Mr. Mill's plan was totally impracticable; it would be "chaos come again." The condition of Ireland was not so bad as to justify such a policy of despair. He promised to co-operate with Lord Mayo in passing the Bills which he had promised to introduce, but he expected no practical result from a Commission of Inquiry. He complained grievously of the small share which the Church question occupied in the Government programme. This question, he maintained, lay at the root of Irish grievances, and the vast benefits which would result from removing it had never been sufficiently appreciated. Above all, it would break down the wall of separation between landlord and tenant, and would probably aid materially in the settlement of the land difficulty. But the policy of the Government was little more than begging time to work themselves up to the old Appropriation Clause. The Church was an institution maintained in one country by the external force of another, and its abolition had passed far beyond inquiry. He defended the Liberal party and Mr. Gladstone for not having dealt with the grievance when they were in power, observing that these settlements were questions of times and seasons, of opportunities and possibilities. It was now possible to settle this question, and therefore it became obligatory.

Mr. Newdegate exhorted the House to proclaim clearly that neither by agitation nor by rebellion would it be terrified into legislation dangerous to the empire at large. He charged the Jesuits, moved by their hatred to all Protestant Governments, with stimulating the Fenian conspiracy, and he solemnly denounced the contemplated University in the interests of the Roman Catholic laity, on whom it would impose an intolerable tyranny.

Mr. Bright concluded from the co-existence in Ireland of material prosperity with extensive disloyalty that the condition of that country was the most urgent imperial question of the day. For that unhappy condition there must be a cause, and that cause was well known to the Government, particularly to the Premier, as was shown by his celebrated phrase, "an absentee aristocracy and an alien Church." Dealing with the first of these two causes, he examined minutely the provisions of Lord Mayo's Bill, which he contended would never work, and he preferred his own plan for the encouragement of a farmer proprietary, which he explained at length. If it were right to lend money to tenants for improvements, as Lord Mayo proposed, why not lend money to tenants to buy land? Protesting that he had no desire to interfere with the rights of property—for he would not apply his plan except where land-owners were willing to sell—he showed that, without paying more annually than his present rent, a tenant in a little over thirty years might become the owner of his farm. His object was to create in Ireland some few score thousands of a steady class between the large landowners and the landless—a class which

would be thoroughly loyal, and would be the zealous enemy of Fenianism. He admitted that the time would never come when Mr. Mill's remedy would be necessary for Ireland, but he held that in every country where there was no class but landlord and tenant, with no manufactures to absorb the population, the condition of the cultivator of the soil must inevitably be degraded. On the Church question Mr. Bright described the Ministerial proposal as grotesque and imbecile. The establishment of a Catholic University could have no effect on Fenianism; it had been received with general disfavour; and, like the dual vote of last year, when it had served its object it would probably disappear. But Protestant ascendancy in Ireland, as represented by a State Church, was doomed, and perfect religious equality on the voluntary principle must be established in its place. There might be difficulties in carrying out this change, but they must be faced; and, condemning Lord Russell's recent pamphlet as forty years too late, Mr. Bright developed a plan of his own for the purpose. He would disestablish and disendow all Churches alike; the *Regium Donum* must go as well as the Maynooth grant. But as the life interests of the Protestant bishops and priests must be preserved, so must the life interests of the Presbyterian ministers and of Maynooth College be provided for. Where the congregations of existing Protestant churches would undertake to repair them and the parsonage-houses, they might be left in possession of them. Of course, no more Bishops, except on the footing of Scotch Bishops, would be created; and if the State granted any provision at the outset to either of the three religious bodies it must become its absolute property, entirely free from the control of the State. The whole of the Church property being Irish property, it must be disposed of in accordance with the desires of the Irish people. Though not sanguine that Mr. Disraeli would be able to deal radically with it, Mr. Bright protested that he should be delighted to co-operate with him in settling this question; and in one of his finest perorations he appealed to the moderation, the justice, and the upright and Christian feeling of all classes. "After all," concluded the honourable member, "we are all, I believe, of one religion. I suppose there will come a time in the history of the world when men will be astonished that Catholics and Protestants, Churchmen and Non-conformists, have entertained such suspicion of and animosity against each other. I accept and believe in a very grand passage I once met with in the writings of the founder of the State of Pennsylvania. He says that 'humble, meek, merciful, just, pious, and devout souls are every where of one religion, and when death has taken off the mask they all know one another, though the divers liveries they wear here make them strangers.' Let us act in this spirit, and our work is easy. Towards the conclusion of his speech the noble lord spoke of the cloud which at present hangs over Ireland. It is a dark and heavy cloud; its darkness extends to the

feelings of men in all parts of the British Empire ; but there is a solution we may all take to ourselves. An inspired king and bard and prophet has left us words which are not only the expression of a fact, but which we may take as the utterance of a prophecy. He says, 'To the upright there ariseth light in the darkness.' Let us try on this matter to be upright ; let us try to be just. That cloud will be dispelled and the danger which we see will vanish, and we may perhaps have the happiness of leaving to our children the heritage of an honourable citizenship in a united and prosperous empire."

Sir Stafford Northcote observed that the problem now before Parliament was, no doubt, a difficult one, but the first thing to do with a disease which might be said to be on the nerves was to give hope and comfort, and not to disturb any healing process which was going on. He claimed for the Irish Government, not limiting it to the present Administration, that it had administered Ireland with impartial justice, and the conviction of this must in time come home to all classes. He defended the Land Bill which Lord Mayo would introduce, expressing a strong conviction that the landlords of Ireland would not object to a restriction of their rights if it could be shown that the public interest required it. But it was not intended that this Bill should necessarily be the 'be all and end all' of the Government policy, and for that reason, and not for delay, the Government had appointed a Commission of Inquiry. As to the Church, Sir Stafford said that if he believed its maintenance to be unjust he would consent to sweep it away immediately ; but he was unable to see that it was, except on a principle which would be destructive of all establishments. The property of the Church was not national property, but the private property of the Church ; and though the State might have a right to inquire how the Church was using the property, to deprive her of it without a violent necessity proved would be a breach of statesmanship. Ireland required a healing policy, and confiscation would be unjust and irritating.

Mr. Monsell admitted that the proposal to charter a Catholic University showed a feeling of respect for the Roman Catholics of Ireland which called for gratitude, though he personally preferred that Dublin University should be thrown open to all religions. Multiplication of Universities, he showed by reference to Germany and the United States, invariably led to their degradation ; but he intimated his readiness to accept this project if it should be favourably received in Ireland. On the land question he remarked that no Bill would be satisfactory which did not give security of tenure, and that Mr. Bright's plan deserved consideration. But there could be no peace in Ireland until the Irish Church was abolished.

After several other members had addressed the House, and when the fourth night of the debate was drawing to a close, Mr. Gladstone rose and delivered a speech remarkable, among its other

features, for the distinct and emphatic declaration which it contained respecting the necessity for the disconnexion of the Protestant Established Church from the State. The announcement thus made by the leader of the Opposition party, gave the keynote to that expression of opinion which was taken up as the symbol of their faith by the Liberal party, both in the subsequent debates in Parliament and afterwards at the various elections throughout the country. Mr. Gladstone commenced his speech by pointing out to the House that, numerous as had been the blots hit in the Ministerial programme, their greatest error of all was that they had failed to realize the grave fact that we had reached a crisis in the Irish question. Ireland had an account with this country which had endured for centuries, and in the opinion of every enlightened nation in the world, much as we had done, we had not done enough to place ourselves in the right. The most recent proof of this failure of the Government to grasp the gravity of the occasion was Sir Stafford Northcote's speech; for the impartiality of the Executive Government, to which he trusted, was not sufficient to counterbalance the injurious effect of unjust laws. Time, his second palliative, had been tried some centuries, and of the third palliative—justice—he remarked that Sir Stafford's idea of it included the maintenance of the Irish Church. Admitting that Lord Mayo's account of the state of Ireland was, on the whole, accurate, he argued that the co-existence of material progress with wide-spread discontent was a proof that some unsatisfied necessity still existed, and in enforcing the gravity of the political crisis he pointed to the depletion of Ireland by emigration, the repeated suspension of the Habeas Corpus, and the invasion of England by Fenianism. Mr. Gladstone next discussed at length the adequacy of the Government policy to the exigencies of the case under six heads, viz.:—Parliamentary Reform, the Repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, Railways, Education, Land, and the Church. The first three he dismissed very briefly, and on the question of University education he remarked that the Roman Catholics had a real grievance. He defended the action of Lord Russell's Government in 1866 on this subject, and in discussing Lord Mayo's suggestion he insisted, with much emphasis, that Parliament had never voluntarily undertaken the support of denominational Universities and schools; but, on the contrary, of late years it had been sedulously endeavouring to get rid of all votes of a purely denominational character. Mr. Disraeli must know as well as any one that such a scheme as this could not be carried into effect; it was a mere idea, which in reality was dead before it had lived; and in the absence of any information as to the views of the Roman Catholic bishops it might be described as another "leap in the dark." But it was impossible to give a final opinion on the University question until the view of Parliament on the Irish Church was ascertained; for if a sweeping policy were adopted, it would be necessary to consider how far Trinity College could be made available. On the

land question Mr. Gladstone asserted that the real grievance of the Irish people had been acknowledged by the Devon Commission, which had recommended a measure of compensation for improvements. A just land law he laid down to be one under which, in the absence of any contract between landlord and tenant, the improvements effected by the tenant should be his property, and he preferred to trust rather to the operation of such a security than to any measure for *fixity of tenure*. Commenting on Mr. Bright's plan, he pointed out some difficulties in it; he suggested that if the Government took possession of the Irish Church property, the experiment could be tried there. Passing to the Church question, Mr. Gladstone congratulated the House on the rapid advance of public opinion, as shown, perhaps, more forcibly in the defence of the Church than in the attack. After condemning strenuously Lord Mayo's hint at an increase in the *Regium Donum* and a subsidy to the Roman Catholics from the Consolidated Fund, and ridiculing the Government pleas for delay, he announced, amid loud cheers from the Opposition, his opinion that 'the Church, as a State Church, must cease to exist.' Religious equality must be established, difficult though the operation might be; but he decidedly condemned the principle of bringing up other denominations to the level of the Church by grants from the Consolidated Fund, and the plan for re-dividing her revenues among the clergy of different denominations. Those plans had long passed the point of practical possibility. On the whole, he agreed very much with Mr. Bright's mode of effecting this great operation. He recommended Mr. Maguire to withdraw his motion, but he intimated that unless Mr. Disraeli's speech differed altogether from the speeches of his colleagues, it would be the duty of the Opposition to ask a decided opinion from the House on this question; and it must not be a mere empty declaration, but must be attended by some practical step which would show the Irish people that Parliament was now in earnest.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in answering Mr. Gladstone's speech, commenced by ironically bewailing the unhappy fate which made the commencement of his own Ministerial career coincident with the imperious necessity of immediately settling an account seven centuries old. Examining the elements of the Irish crisis, as stated by Mr. Gladstone, he showed that all of them had existed while he was in office, and that no attempt had been made to deal with them. Commencing with the University project, he defended the Ministerial programme in detail. The object of the proposed charter was to extend to the Irish Roman Catholics the opportunity they had long desired of giving their children the benefits of a higher education under the influence of their own priesthood; and the sarcasm of Mr. Horsman, that it was meant to conciliate Ultramontaniam, was absurd, as he showed by a recapitulation of the facts relating to the Queen's Colleges, which Mr. Horsman, he said, had totally misrepresented. He vindicated next the land

policy of the Government, premising that in this and all other cases the Government had proposed, not that which was theoretically perfect, but which was practical and practicable. They had picked out all those points on which there was a general agreement that legislation was possible, while they had referred to a Commission those points only which were not ripe for decision, and he characterized the assertion that the object of the Commission was delay as "the lees and refuse of factious insinuation." Passing to the Church question, and admitting that the Irish Church was not in the position he should wish to see her, of having in her communion the majority of the people, Mr. Disraeli discussed and defended the principle of ecclesiastical endowments. He denied that the spirit of the age was opposed to endowments, as had been laid down by Mr. Bright, who, with the aid of the philosophers, had apparently converted Mr. Gladstone to the same opinion. He warned the House that it was not the comparatively limited issue of the Irish Church, it was the principle of ecclesiastical endowments, an entire revolution in the national habit and character, which was at stake. He denied the moral competence of the House to decide that issue without an appeal to the country. It was a question which the country alone could decide. For thirty years the Liberal party had been in power, but what had they done to prepare the public mind for such a revolution? This Parliament, he held, ought not to decide it; it ought to be reserved for the new and enlarged constituencies. Being personally in favour of ecclesiastical endowments, he strongly objected to the destruction of the Irish Church. The violence and confiscation with which it must be accompanied would be a great detriment to Ireland, where there had already been violence and confiscation enough; but he reserved to himself the right of considering the labours of the Commission now sitting, and at the same time he expressed a decided opinion that the moment had arrived when there must be a considerable change in the condition of the unendowed clergy of Ireland which would elevate their influence. By this he did not mean what was vulgarly called "paying the priests," making them the stipendiaries of the State, of which he strongly disapproved. Referring to his oft-quoted speech of 1844, he maintained that, though expressed, perhaps, with the heedless rhetoric which appeared to be the appanage of all who sat below the gangway, the sentiment of it was right, and he concluded by avowing his belief that the Ministerial programme was the commencement of a new policy for Ireland.

Mr. Maguire then, expressing his satisfaction at the result of the debate, and in deference to Mr. Gladstone's appeal to him, withdrew his motion.

The leader of the Opposition having thus definitely pledged himself in the face of Parliament to the decisive step of disestablishing the Irish Protestant Church, lost no time in taking the next step in the prosecution of his purpose. On the 23rd of March

Mr. Gladstone laid on the table of the House of Commons three resolutions which he intended to move in a Committee of the whole House upon the Acts relating to the Irish Establishment. The terms of the resolutions were as follows: "1. That in the opinion of this House it is necessary that the Established Church of Ireland should cease to exist as an Establishment, due regard being had to all personal interests and to all individual rights of property. 2. That subject to the foregoing considerations, it is expedient to prevent the creation of new personal interests by the exercise of any public patronage, and to confine the operations of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of Ireland to objects of immediate necessity or involving individual rights, pending the final decision of Parliament. 3. That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, humbly to pray that, with a view to the purposes aforesaid, Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to place at the disposal of Parliament her interest in the temporalities in archbishoprics, bishoprics, and other ecclesiastical dignities and benefices in Ireland and in the custody thereof." The right honourable gentleman at the same time inquired whether it would be convenient to the Government to assign a day for bringing on the above resolutions.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, observing that his inclination would be to give as early an opportunity as possible for meeting a notice of this description, fixed the following Monday (March 30th) for the purpose. In the meantime a notice of an amendment in the following terms was given by Lord Stanley:—"That this House, while admitting that considerable modifications in the temporalities of the United Church in Ireland may, after the pending inquiry, appear to be expedient, is of opinion that any proposition tending to the disestablishment or disendowment of that Church ought to be reserved for the decision of a new Parliament."

On the 30th of March the Debate on Mr. Gladstone's motion and Lord Stanley's amendment commenced. The titles of the Acts relating to the Church Establishment were first read by the Clerk of the House, after which, on the motion of Colonel S. Knox, the 5th Article of the Act of Union, and, on that of Mr. H. E. Surtees, the portion of the Act of William and Mary containing the Coronation Oath of the Sovereign, were read from the Table. Mr. Gladstone then rose in a densely crowded House, and amidst manifestations of the most eager interest, to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee on the Irish Church. He said he could not regret that hon. gentlemen had interposed motions for the reading of extracts from the existing laws, inasmuch as they had reminded the House that they were now about to enter upon a solemn duty, and that the solemn controversy into which they were about to enter should not be degraded into a warfare of trick and contrivance, but should be conducted in a spirit befitting the magnitude of the issue. He

had originally intended to explain his resolutions in committee, but as Lord Stanley had notified an amendment raising the merits of the case, he (Mr. Gladstone) would explain his resolutions as being in antagonism with that of the noble lord. His intention was, if the House went into committee, to ask them to assert, in the first place, that in their opinion the time had come when the Established Church in Ireland should cease to exist as an Establishment. That cessation should be effected in a manner worthy of the nation, affording ample consideration and satisfaction to every proprietary and vested right, and regarding matters of feeling as well as matters of strict rule, and in every doubtful case adopting such mode of proceeding as would be consistent with the largest principles of equity, and to further the object of these proceedings it would be necessary to put an end in Ireland to all endowment and to all grants from the Consolidated Fund to any religious denomination whatever. After satisfying every just claim they would have to contemplate a residue. That residue should be treated as an Irish Fund applicable to the exclusive benefit of Ireland. There had until now been no state of public opinion which would have enabled a Government to deal with this question. The Liberal party and the Conservative party had alike abstained from taking up the subject, and they were justified in that course, as there was previous to this time no state of feeling or of public opinion which would have enabled this great question to be opened on the wide basis which it required. He had heard much not only of apostasy, but of sudden apostasy. There were many members of this House who knew that suddenness was a relative term; but a change which extended over a quarter of a century could hardly be deemed a sudden change. In 1846 he (Mr. Gladstone) having then lost his seat on account of the corn laws, was invited to oppose a member of Lord Russell's Cabinet and obtain for himself a seat in Parliament; but he refused, because they had both voted on the same side as to free trade, and because the Irish Church question was then likely to come forward, and he felt it impossible to pledge himself to maintain it. In the following year he had a contest for the University of Oxford. Application was then made to him to know his views as to the Irish Church, and he replied that he did not anticipate the proposal of any plan which would lead him to vote for a change in the ecclesiastical establishment of Ireland, but that to maintain it in principle he must entirely decline. In 1865 it appeared to him that the coming Parliament would probably have to deal with the question, and he at once gave notice to his constituents, detaching himself wholly and absolutely from the maintenance of the Irish Church, either on a larger or more contracted scale. Having given this notice, the constituency, as they were perfectly entitled, took advantage of it, and in consequence thereof he was not now member for Oxford but for South Lancashire. Now, coming to the subject of vested interests, it would be a question whether they should limit com-

pensation to those who were in possession of benefices, or whether they should also not have regard to those who had devoted themselves to an indelible profession in the expectation of being hereafter appointed to benefices. All he said was that he did not at this moment absolutely shut the door against them. He apprehended that there would be no desire to deprive the Protestant community of the fabrics, provided they wished to apply them to religious purposes; and the same principle would be applied to the residences of the clergy. In addition to that, the proprietors of advowsons would have a strict claim to compensation; but he believed that the benefices in private hands only amounted to one-sixth of the whole. There were likewise private endowments by persons who had devoted their own money to this purpose. The effect of the process would be, that of the money value of the endowments not less than three-fifths, possibly two-thirds, would remain in the hands of the Anglican communion in Ireland, and they would hold it with the perfect and cordial good-will of all sects and persuasions, both in this country and in Ireland. It was said that the disendowment of the Irish Church would be dangerous to the Church of England. Assertion might be met by assertion, and he claimed the liberty of making an absolutely opposite assertion. He held that it would be dangerous to the Church of England to hold her to be in communion with a state of things politically dangerous and socially unjust. It could not be said that the existence of the Irish Church establishment was necessary for the maintenance of Protestantism in Ireland. The penal laws, while they were in force, were to a certain degree successful; the proportion of Roman Catholics to Protestants decreased, but since those laws were repealed the proportion of Catholics to Protestants had increased; and though the census of 1861 showed a small proportionate increase of Protestants, the rate of conversion was so small that it would take 1500 or 2000 years to effect an entire conversion if it went on at the same rate. He asked the House to agree to the principle of disendowment; and, further than that, he asked them to arrest at this particular moment the creation of new vested interests. The object of the third resolution was to arrest episcopal appointments, but not to interfere with parochial appointments in private patronage. It would also be necessary to stop the proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commission. This could only be done by Act of Parliament. In the first part of the proposal he wished to test the question whether the time had come for dealing with the Established Church in Ireland; and if they decided that in the affirmative, he trusted they would not restrict their action to an abstract resolution, for he had never known an abstract resolution to be the foundation of any thing but false hopes. The final arrangements he thought ought to be left to a reformed Parliament, but he proposed that they should prevent by legislation this Session the growing of a new crop of vested interests. There had been a

connexion for 700 years between this country and Ireland, and during almost the whole of that connexion there had been a succession of storms and temporary calms. From time to time the Irish problem had been dealt with, but it had never been dealt with by removing the whole cause of dispute; and what had been done had always been done under the pressure of danger. Could they be surprised that the Irish people had failed to exhibit gratitude? He appealed to the House to amend this course, and to do all they could towards clearing their account with Ireland.

Lord Stanley followed Mr. Gladstone, and moved his amendment in the terms which have been already given. The noble lord began by echoing Mr. Gladstone's condemnation of a resort to trickery, more particularly as he foresaw that great efforts would be made to put the question on a false issue. Mr. Gladstone's resolutions—though his speech said much—said nothing about disendowment; and he objected to them, first of all, because they were too general, shadowed out no practical plan, and might be construed in any sense. Those who meant by disestablishment the release of the Church from State control might accept the resolutions with the reservation that they should retain the endowment. The resolutions avoided all the real difficulties of the case, and gave no inkling of the manner in which the process of disestablishment was to be effected. But the real question, Lord Stanley said, was not whether any thing should be done, but what was the particular thing to be done. Not one educated man out of a hundred ("and I," Lord Stanley said, "am not the one") would maintain that the ecclesiastical establishment of Ireland was all that it should be, or that there were no scandals in it; but those who called for a disturbance of the existing state of things were under an obligation to indicate some practical solution. Lord Stanley discussed next the numerous plans suggested for the disposal of the property of the Irish Church, remarking that at present public opinion could not see its way to the practicability of any one of them; and he maintained that Mr. Gladstone's resolutions merely came to this—that something must be done, without saying what it was. Even if the resolutions were carried, what was to be done then? There could be no legislation this year except that required to carry out the two last resolutions, which was no legislation at all. They might pledge this Parliament which must come to an end almost immediately, but they could not pledge the new constituencies, who must, as a matter of course, take up this question first of all. After enforcing his objections to the unpractical character of the resolutions and the impossibility of taking action on them now, or of pledging the Parliament of the future, Lord Stanley deprecated this particular mode of raising the question, appealing to the experience of the Appropriation Clause and the Reform Resolution of 1859, and insinuating that the real object of the Opposition was to get a good electioneering

cry. Disclaiming all desire to taunt either Mr. Gladstone or the Liberal party with inconsistency (for on that head each side required allowance to be made), he condemned strongly a change so sudden as the present, which would not wait for the necessary business of the Session to be completed, but called for a resolution to which no practical effect could be given, and about the details of which its supporters would inevitably disagree the moment they began to carry them out. As to this being a message of peace to Ireland, would it be so received in the North? On the contrary, it would produce bitterness and animosity, and he denied that it would conciliate the Roman Catholic peasantry, who regarded as of greater importance the land and the education questions. Lord Stanley concluded by defending his amendment, the meaning of which was that the work of the Session was sufficient for the Session. Whenever action was necessary the Government would not be unprepared for it, but action now was impossible, and the Government objected to pledging in any way the judgment of the next Parliament.

The debate thus commenced was carried on for four nights by adjournment. Most of the leading members took part in it, the most prominent speakers being those of whose arguments we shall now give a brief recapitulation. Among these the speech of Lord Cranbourne was listened to with marked attention, owing to the position held by that noble lord in relation to the two parties represented by the Ministers and their opponents.

The noble lord, anticipating that there would be future opportunities for discussing the principles of Mr. Gladstone's resolutions, proposed to examine Lord Stanley's reasons for delay, but avowed a warm and decided approval of the principle of Establishments, and pledged himself not to desert it even in this hour of extremity. He doubted whether the result aimed at in this case would be worth the sacrifice, for peace could not be attained in Ireland by irritating and insulting the feelings of one-third of the population—the wealthiest and the most influential. Commenting in a tone of some severity on Lord Stanley's amendment—which he described as “a more than Delphic resolution”—and expressing his deep disappointment that a principle had not been laid down on which the Conservative party could fight and appeal to the tribunal of public opinion, Lord Cranbourne complained that it gave no clue to the policy of the Ministers. No amount of disestablishment or disendowment was excluded by this amendment, nor, remembering the events of last year, could the declarations of any subordinate Minister give a satisfactory pledge for the course of their erratic leader. In 1865 Lord Stanley had seconded a resolution which, like this, made general admissions and pleaded for delay, and the end of it was household suffrage. And so he predicted the result of carrying this amendment would be that next year, perhaps, the Irish Protestant members would find themselves voting humbly with Mr. Disraeli for the disestablishment of

the Irish Church. This ambiguity of the amendment indicated either no policy at all, or a policy which the Ministry was afraid to avow; and he strongly condemned such a system of management as unworthy of the House of Commons and degrading to the functions of the Executive. Though ready to meet the resolutions with a plain straightforward negative, he refused to support an amendment the object of which was merely to gain time and to enable the Government to keep the cards in their hands for another year to shuffle as they pleased.

Mr. Moncreiff was of opinion that Lord Stanley's speech had given the death-blow to the Irish Church; and he combated at some length the suggestion that this Parliament, which had passed a Reform Bill for England, and was engaged in passing Bills for Scotland and Ireland, could not pass these resolutions. He argued too against the objection that the resolutions would touch the Churches of England and Scotland, and insisted that the removal of this grievance would be effected by the Protestant feeling of the country.

Mr. Laing supported the resolutions, but feeling that it would be impossible to give them practical effect this year, he intimated that if they were carried he should move an amendment, deferring further action until after an appeal to the new constituencies.

Mr. Gathorne Hardy entered upon a defence of the Irish Church, which elicited warm tokens of sympathy from the Conservative benches, and in its general tone was in marked contrast to the rather chilling speech delivered on the preceding day by the Secretary for Foreign Affairs. The right hon. gentleman admitted that the question must be dealt with, but objected to the time at which it had been raised, and said it had been used as the means of attacking not only the Irish Church, but her Majesty's Ministers, and the attack had been made not only on their front, but on their flank. He admitted that, with a view to strengthen the Irish Church, great reforms and modifications were needed. But when the House had before it the Scotch and Irish Reform Bills, and was encumbered with other business, this was not the time to come forward with an abstract resolution. He complained that the question had been suddenly taken up, and that the country had been taken by surprise. He asked when it had been known that Mr. Gladstone had changed his opinion on the subject, and read a letter which appeared in the *Morning Herald* in 1865, in which the writer asserted that Mr. Gladstone, in a letter to a member of his Election Committee, had spoken of the Irish Church as a question so remote, and so far out of the range of practical politics, that it was not likely he would ever be called on to deal with it, but that if he were, it was a matter on which they had no right to set the Act of Union aside. Passing to the arguments of Mr. Gladstone, he asked, with regard to the objection that the resolutions involved a subversion of property, whether there was no fear that that would be the effect, and if

schemes of a revolutionary character affecting the land had not been already put forth. The main question after all was what they were going to do with the funds. There was no plan put forward, and they had arrived at this, that the unsettlement of every thing was plain, but the settlement of nothing was clear. When it was said that this proceeding would not affect the Scotch and English Churches, he replied that he understood religious equality as a principle, but he did not understand it as a practice affecting one part of the empire only. If they touched one establishment they touched all. He denied that there was any emergency to justify the resolutions, and said that if the amendment were overthrown the Government would oppose the resolutions. And if they were asked what they would do in a future Parliament—for they would have no opportunity of doing any thing in this—they would give no pledge, except that what they would do would be in accordance with the former part of the amendment; and if they found, from the report of the Commission, that modifications and changes were required, they would make them with a fearless hand; but for himself at least, he would not be a party to any measure for disestablishing the Church which upheld the light of the Reformation in the midst of Ireland.

Mr. Bright commenced by remarking on the considerable change, if not of view, at least of expression, which had characterized the debate. Even Lord Cranbourne had seemed to admit that the time was near at hand for surrendering his cherished principle of an Establishment, while the Government spoke with a different voice from night to night. Mr. Hardy, in a speech which Mr. Bright complimented highly, had answered Lord Stanley, and probably Mr. Disraeli would answer Mr. Hardy. This was the result of government by a minority, on the inconveniences of which Mr. Bright dwelt with great felicity. The result was confusion and chaos; there was really neither Government nor Opposition; the Ministerialists could neither support their own views nor adopt those of the Opposition. Passing to the main question, Mr. Bright pointed out that the disestablishment, which had been described as a "revolution," only affected 700,000 people, or 100,000 families, about the population of Liverpool or Manchester, and if this change were effected, the Irish Protestants would only be left in the same position as the majority of the Scotch people, nearly all the Welsh people, half of the English people, and the whole of our colonists. There were only two pretences on which a State Church could be justified—religious and political. As a religious institution for the conversion of Roman Catholics the Irish Church had been a deplorable failure. Indeed it had made the Irish Catholics of Ireland more intensely Roman than in any other country, and the political influence of Rome Mr. Bright held to be a great calamity. As a political institution it had been equally a failure; for though the State for years had defended it by the sword, the present condition of Ireland was

anarchy subdued by force. This change, Mr. Bright asserted (in spite of a few faint denials), was desired by an influential and wise minority of Irish Protestants. From peer to peasant the Roman Catholics were unanimous in its favour, and the people of England and Scotland would eagerly welcome this great act of atonement for past errors. If such evils had been produced in any of our colonies by a State Church, Parliament would have abolished it at once. As to any danger to the Church of England, her greatest enemy was not the Liberation Society, but zeal—the chief peril of all establishments—whether developed in Ritualism or Evangelicism. As long as she preserved internal harmony, the boldest prophet would not predict the day of her downfall. Reasoning calmly with the Ministerialists, Mr. Bright endeavoured to persuade them that this disestablishment was not more serious than Free Trade, Reform, and other changes which they had once resisted, and had since found to be mere hobgoblins, and after an emphatic and significant disclaimer of party and personal motives, he concluded with an eloquent exhortation to them not to close their ears to moderate counsels, and not to increase the discontent of Ireland and play the game of the Fenians by refusing this great act of justice.

Mr. Roebuck supported the resolutions, believing a Church Establishment to be a bad instrument for teaching religion. He, however, denied that the Established Church was a badge of conquest, or a tax upon Roman Catholics, as the tithes belonged to the State. He warned Mr. Gladstone not to repeat the conduct of Earl Russell, who obtained power by carrying the Appropriation Clause, and then took no further steps, but to be ready with his Bill to carry the resolutions into effect.

Mr. Henley said the resolutions were calculated to carry out the desires of the Fenians. All that was said in favour of these resolutions went to the disestablishment of all Churches. If he voted for them he should feel that he was a traitor to his country, his Sovereign, and his God.

General Peel regretted that Mr. Gladstone, in order to induce “the rabble” to follow him into the lobby, had thought it necessary to ask the House to disestablish the Protestant Church in Ireland, and to set aside the coronation oath. If this measure were carried, the inevitable consequence would be the separation of the Church and State in this country, and the repeal of the union with Ireland. It was difficult to know what the amendment meant. It might mean any thing. The way he read it was, that the Cabinet was hardly converted yet, and that the party behind them was not yet sufficiently educated. He, however, entirely agreed with the speech of the Home Secretary, and so long as the right hon. gentleman sat on the Treasury bench should feel perfectly secure.

Mr. Lowe said if they took a hundred average Irishmen it would be found that seventy-eight were Roman Catholics, eleven belonged to the Protestant Endowed Church, ten to the Presbyterian, and

the remaining one belonged to the waifs and strays. These figures were more eloquent than any words he could use. He asked what Englishmen would do if the Roman Catholic Church were established in this country. He denied altogether the validity of the argument that they were incapacitated by the Act of Union from dealing with this question. He referred to a recent letter from Mr. Disraeli to Lord Dartmouth, in which, he said, the right hon. gentleman out-Heroded Herod in the way in which he upheld the Establishment, and yet, on the evening of the day on which that letter was published Lord Stanley gave notice of his amendment, which virtually gave up the principle of the Establishment. And as if this were not enough, the Government put up the noble lord to make a speech in which he led the House to believe that the Government would be ready on a future occasion to make an alteration in the status of the Church, and the following evening they put up the Home Secretary to contradict every thing the noble lord had said. It was a tentative process, and when the Government saw that a thing did not take it was withdrawn. Now the House of Commons had endured a good deal of this kind of thing. They had all been lowered by it; the Government had been lowered, and the estimation of public men in the country had been irretrievably lowered by it. He rose to denounce it. He reminded hon. members who attempted to link together the Irish and the English Church of a tyrant who bound a dead body to a living one. The corruption of the dead body killed the living body—and so would the Irish Church kill the English Church. "The Irish Church," said Mr. Lowe, in conclusion, "is founded on injustice; it is founded on the dominant rights of the few over the many, and shall not stand. You call it a Missionary Church. If so, its mission is unfulfilled. As a Missionary Church it has failed utterly. Like some exotic brought from a far country, with infinite pains and useless trouble, it is kept alive with difficulty and expense in an ungrateful climate and ungenial soil. The curse of barrenness is upon it; it has no leaves; it bears no blossoms; it yields no fruit. Cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?"

Sir Stafford Northcote said the primary object of these resolutions was to rally the Liberal party, and turn out the Government; the secondary object was to abolish the Irish Church. The resolutions had been constructed upon the principle not of settling the Irish Church, but that they should contain so much as it was probable the Government would not be able to accept, and yet not contain any thing that might raise difficulties in their own way. The position of the Government was not changed.* They would vote with the Foreign Secretary on the question of time, and if they were beaten on that they should oppose the resolutions on principle. They did not deny the power of this Parliament to deal with the question, but said that it was elected when the question was not of practical importance, and therefore it would not be fair to the con-

stituencies to come to a decision without consulting them. They were at the beginning of a long fight, and Government would not give in till they had fairly fought it out. He looked upon the measure proposed as a counter irritant, by which it was proposed to tranquilize the Catholics by irritating the Protestants. Then, he asked, in what position the Church of Ireland was to be, when it was disestablished, with regard to doctrine and discipline, and whether the Crown was to have the appointment of the Bishops, or the congregations?

Mr. Coleridge argued that the State had as much right to deal with the social and temporal incidents of a Church, which made up the idea of an Establishment, as with any other institution—the Statute-book, indeed, showed that Parliament had always claimed a right to deal with this kind of property more freely than any other. Dealing with the objections to the resolutions, he maintained that this could be no attack on the English Establishment, unless its circumstances should become exactly the same as those of the Irish Church; and on the “compact” objection, he observed, that no Parliament could bind its successors, and that this Parliament had as much right to deal with the Act of Union as with any other statute. Nobody had defended the Irish Church on principle. Mr. Disraeli in his letter and Lord Stanley in his speech had not said a word which excluded the idea of its disestablishment, and even Mr. Hardy’s speech was not irreconcilable with it. This interpretation of his speech, however, Mr. Hardy promptly contradicted, and repeated that the Government would offer every opposition to the resolutions, and would take no part in the disestablishment of the Irish Church. Mr. Coleridge went on to contend that the Government had ample information at their disposal for dealing with the question at once, and the strongest argument in favour of passing the resolutions was the assurance they would give the people of Ireland that we were willing to look at Irish questions from an Irish point of view. That it might not turn out to be a complete panacea for Irish grievances was no argument against its acceptance.

The Earl of Mayo, referring to the predictions so confidently made of the approaching downfall of the Establishment, retorted that this prophecy had frequently been made, but nevertheless the Irish Church, he believed, would for many years longer—though amended, no doubt, and reformed—flourish in security and full activity. Replying to Mr. Lowe’s charges of inconsistency, he maintained that in all the Ministerial speeches the intention of resisting the disestablishment of the Irish Church had been unequivocally expressed. The Government did not deny the competence of this Parliament to deal with the question, but they held it to be of such magnitude and importance that it ought not to be taken up in a Session so encumbered with other business, or by abstract resolutions. Lord Mayo argued next that the voluntary principle which Mr. Gladstone proposed to establish

was utterly inapplicable to Ireland, and that it would increase the animosities already prevailing there. The Roman Catholic Church in Ireland was not now purely voluntary, and its efficiency, he maintained, would be increased by an extended application of the principle of endowments. Of late it had been growing rapidly in wealth, and he warned the Roman Catholics that their present allies in the scheme of confiscation would be the first at some future time to attack their endowments. Examining Mr. Gladstone's scheme in detail, he showed its impracticability in various lights. The compensations he contemplated would swallow up pretty nearly all the capital value of the Church revenues, while merely to allow the incumbents to die out, and then sequester the livings, would delay indefinitely the voluntary arrangements which must follow the destruction of the Irish Church. In like manner he showed that all the suggestions which had been made for disposing of the surplus would only open so many new causes of animosity. Though he had never used the "garrison" argument, he warned the House that the destruction of the Church would increase absenteeism in many rural districts, and he denied emphatically, supporting his contention by numerous extracts from the opinions of Fenian organs, that the discontent of Ireland had any connexion with the Irish Church.

Mr. Cardwell appealed to Mr. Disraeli to state whether the issue to be laid before the country was to be found in the speeches of Lord Stanley, of Mr. Hardy, or of Lord Mayo, and to explain distinctly whether he adhered to his speech of 1844, or to his recent letter. In Ireland, as must be obvious to the most superficial observer, there were two distinct peoples, and the Irish Church was at once the symbol and the cause of their complete separation. Pronouncing unreservedly for the abolition of the Irish Church, Mr. Cardwell argued that the time had now arrived for calling on Parliament for a decided opinion, though the ultimate decision must be left to the new constituencies.

Mr. Disraeli began by stating his views of Mr. Gladstone's meaning—that he proposed to terminate the connexion between Church and State as far as the Irish Church was concerned; that he intended a disestablishment, which must lead to a disendowment. This question having suddenly been brought before Parliament, the Government had to consider how they would meet it. Considering that it was brought forward by the leader of the Opposition, and the other circumstances attending it, the "previous question" was impossible—a direct negative would have led to an inference that the Government did not admit any modification to be necessary, which was not their opinion. The third course open to them was an amendment, and in defending Lord Stanley's amendment Mr. Disraeli quoted a dictum of Sir R. Peel, "Never attempt in your amendment to express your policy." In that amendment there were two points taken, on which the Government were prepared to stand; and, commenting

on the second of them, Mr. Disraeli declared that by his phrase "denying the moral competence of Parliament" he had meant that when a fundamental law of the country was in question, a House of Commons could not decide upon it, elected by a constituency which had never had an intimation that such an attack was contemplated. That this House was not elected with any view to deciding the Irish Church question was shown by Lord Palmerston's manifesto at the last election and Mr. Gladstone's letter quoted in this debate, and though he had never held the Act of Union to be irreversible, it certainly was preposterous to ask Parliament to reverse such a solemn muniment at eight days' notice. After replying, in an effective vein of repartee, to the attacks of Lord Cranbourne and Mr. Lowe, Mr. Disraeli went on to examine the circumstances under which Mr. Gladstone had proposed what he described as a "vast and violent" change. Admitting that Ireland was not in a satisfactory condition, though the people were better off socially and politically than at any other time, he ridiculed Mr. Gladstone's picture of a "crisis" gathered from the dark reminiscences of seven centuries, and refused to argue the Irish question on this fallacious assumption. Vindicating the Irish policy of the Government, he claimed for himself and his party, in or out of office, always to have acted on the principle of reconciling races in Ireland, of strengthening Protestant interests by doing justice to the Roman Catholics, and of putting both creeds on a footing of perfect equality. But the policy now recommended by Mr. Gladstone was in complete antagonism to a policy of conciliation; it would foster anomalies, and indefinitely defer the restoration of political tranquillity. His attack on the Irish Church involved a violation of the rights of property never suggested before in Parliament by any statesman in a position of responsibility; and though recognizing a difference between public and private property as far as the State is concerned, he pressed upon the House to weigh well what effect upon private rights this attack upon Church property might have. To deprive the Church of her property and to indicate no mode of disposing of it was sheer confiscation, but, above all, he protested strongly against the application of it to secular purposes. In the latter part of his speech Mr. Disraeli, responding to Mr. Cardwell's request to have a clear and definite issue submitted to the House, dilated on the importance, not so much to the Church as the State, of maintaining the connexion between political authority and the religious principle; and the only mode of securing that connexion was by an Establishment. If that connexion were terminated in Ireland where would you stop? Why should it not be terminated in Scotland and Wales, and even in England. It was the ulterior consequences of this attack on the Irish Church which he wished to impress on the public mind. Mr. Gladstone appeared here as the representative of a combination of the high Ritualistic party and the supporters of the Pope in Ireland, and under the guise of

legislating in "the spirit of the age," an attack was made on some of the most precious privileges of the subject, which he pledged himself as long as he remained First Minister to resist to the utmost of his ability.

Mr. Gladstone, in reply, dismissing Mr. Disraeli's speech with the remark that most of it was irrelevant, and much of it due to a heated imagination, explained the figures by which he made out that his scheme would leave the Protestants in possession of three-fifths of the present value of the Church property. Answering the various arguments urged in the course of the debate, and acknowledging its general fairness towards himself, he ridiculed the fears expressed of the irritating effects of this change on the minds of the Protestants, and pointed to the numerous successful instances of disestablishment. Mr. Disraeli's argument that a fundamental law of the country could not be dealt with by Parliament without reference to the constituencies, he described as ultra-democratic, if not anarchical. He did not conceal his intention to separate Church from State in Ireland, and that he argued was the most effectual mode of preserving what Mr. Disraeli called the connexion between Government and the religious principle. And to the objection that this would lead to the destruction of the English Church, Mr. Gladstone replied that each Establishment must stand on its own merits, and the Irish Establishment could not be maintained on the ground of its bearing upon that of England. Examining the varying declarations of the Premier, the Home Secretary, and the Irish Secretary, and extracting from them the conclusion that their plan was to endow the Catholic Church, he emphatically condemned it as "too late," contrary to the sense of England and Scotland, and repudiated by the Irish Catholics themselves. Replying to Mr. Roebuck's inquiry whether he was prepared with a Bill, he disclaimed heartily the idea of "huddling the question up in an abstract resolution," and he pointed to the second and third resolutions as a proof that it was not intended once again to mock the people of Ireland with idle words. But while no unreasonable demand was made on the time of an expiring Parliament, he asked it to pronounce an opinion which would clear the way for its successor.

A division was then taken, when the numbers were,—

For Lord Stanley's Amendment	270
Against it	330

Majority against the Government	60
---------------------------------	----

There was a second division, on the question of the House going into Committee, when there appeared,—

For the Motion	328
Against it	272

Majority for Mr. Gladstone's Motion	56
-------------------------------------	----

The House then went into Committee, but after the first resolution had been formally put, the Chairman was directed to report progress.

The majority on this division was larger in favour of Mr. Gladstone's policy than had been anticipated on either side, and produced considerable impression on the public mind as indicating the tendency of opinion and its probable decision on the great question of the Irish Church. Those who desired to see the end of that Establishment derived much encouragement from the judgment pronounced by the House of Commons, reflecting, as on the eve of a general election it was likely to do, the prevailing sentiments of the constituencies. On the other hand, the defenders of the assailed Church were not idle, but exerted themselves by convoking public meetings, and by urgent appeals through the press to rouse the Conservative sentiment of the country on behalf of the menaced institution. The Easter Recess followed immediately upon the termination of the great debate on Lord Stanley's amendment, and an interval occurred before the resumption of the question in Parliament, during which some important meetings were held in the metropolis and in the principal towns upon the Irish Church question. In St. James's Hall two large meetings were called, one on the part of the Liberals, at which Earl Russell presided, another convoked by the Conservatives, at which Mr. Campbell Colquhoun took the chair. At the former the noble lord addressed his auditors in an animated speech, which was cordially applauded. Lord Russell said, "I have pleasure in appearing before you at this great meeting, because it appears to me a crisis of the greatest national importance. The people of England hope to put an end to a war—not a thirty years' war, but a three hundred years' war—which has prevailed on the subject of the Irish Church establishment. I trust that we shall all agree to make a treaty of peace and friendship with the people of Ireland, and that Mr. Gladstone will be furnished with full powers to sign that treaty. The difficulty in speaking of the Irish Church is to find any argument in its defence. Many persons believe that an Established State Church does not promote religion and morality; others, amongst whom I reckon myself, think that it does promote religion and morality. Those who think that it does not are quite ready to give up one of the worst establishments, the Irish Church; whilst those who are in favour of Church establishments consider it a burlesque on establishments to make a Church establishment for one-eighth of a people and against the will of at least six-eighths of the remainder. Therefore, nothing like argument is used in favour of the Irish Church, and instead of arguments we have frightful vaticinations. We are told that if the Irish Church is disestablished there will be an end of our civil and religious liberties; and it has been imparted as a sort of secret to a clergyman in Buckinghamshire that it would be worse than even a foreign conquest of this island. One is puzzled to reconcile that prophecy

with the line taken by Government on Lord Stanley's resolution, that though some modifications might be made, the question of endowment or disendowment should be reserved for the Parliament that is to meet next year. That looked as if disendowment were to be considered next year. Now, if some great military power were to say to us, 'Unless you submit to degrading and dishonourable terms, England will be invaded and conquered next year,' what a strange answer it would be to say, 'We cannot consider it this year, but next year we will take it into consideration.' Really the two parts of the Government proposition do not hang well together. I think that we shall all agree as to the first resolution of Mr. Gladstone, which is clearly for disestablishment, that the sooner it takes place the better. * Now, as to disendowment, my object is equality. The people of Ireland are entitled to see all her Majesty's subjects in Ireland on a footing of equality, and it is rather a secondary operation whether this equality shall be obtained by endowing different religions, or by the disendowment of all. I do not disguise my preferences on that subject. But as I perceive that the Protestant people of England and Scotland do not wish to endow all these communions, and that the Roman Catholics of Ireland do not wish to accept any endowment, I discard any preference of my own, and seek for the disendowment of all. I cannot think that the Church of England will be any loser by the proposed disendowment. It is rather as if you should say to a swimmer, 'I think you would swim better if you had a large lump of lead tied round your neck.' The Church of Ireland is that lump of lead; it does not help the Church of England, but it tends to make it fall to the bottom. There is a very important third resolution of Mr. Gladstone's; it asks the Crown to place at the disposal of Parliament her Majesty's interest in the dignities and benefices of Ireland. That is in conformity with the advice which I gave to King William IV. many years ago, and which the King accepted; but having to contend with Sir R. Peel, Sir J. Graham, and Lord Derby, I did not succeed. I trust that Mr. Gladstone will be more fortunate. I was present at a meeting in another hall in this metropolis, where the late Prince Consort in an elegant speech declared that King William III. was the wisest King that ever reigned in England. When King William ascended the throne it was a question whether Scotland should be compelled to maintain the Episcopal Church of England, but King William, by yielding to the wishes of Scotland, was able to establish the prosperity which has since prevailed there. I have only now to say that a theory has been started of late that instead of having men in whom you can confide to lead you, you should have men with no settled convictions, who are, therefore, more likely to follow any thing that may be started. If I admire and wish to follow Mr. Gladstone it is upon different grounds. It is because although I have seen variations of opinion in him—and what statesman is there who must not confess that he has often changed

opinions on particular subjects?—yet this must be said for Mr. Gladstone, that he has always avowed his opinions, and never made a secret of them. I am persuaded that you may confide in Mr. Gladstone as a leader, in his integrity and in his sincerity, and that, supported by the people of England, he will lead you to victory, and make that permanent peace which I have already alluded to between England and Ireland. When he has done that we shall be stronger in every respect—stronger in our internal relations, stronger in the means of keeping peace in Ireland, and peace every where, stronger against any foreign enemy, if any foreign enemy should presume to attack us. Having, therefore, these convictions I trust you will agree with me, and that you will heartily give your support to Mr. Gladstone in the resolutions which he has proposed.”

The resolutions proposed to the meeting in favour of the dis-establishment and disendowment of the Irish Church were carried by acclamation.

At the other meeting, which manifested no less ardour and zeal in defence of the threatened Establishment, resolutions were passed pledging those present to the most strenuous exertions to maintain the existing connexion of religion with the State, the supremacy of the Crown, and the principles of the Reformation. The Chairman, Mr. Campbell Colquhoun, in his opening address, denounced in uncompromising language the proposed concession to the Roman Catholic party in Ireland. He said he had read wearily through the debates in the House of Commons, and failed to find the real issue clearly stated. The speeches in that House alleged that the Irish Church was a wrong and an injustice, and that if it were removed the people of Ireland would be satisfied. Those who asserted this stood upon a ground which would not bear the weight of a feather. He pledged himself to prove this to any intelligent, honest man, and he did not wish to deal with any other. Mr. Gladstone, in one of his fine sentences, said this grievance touched the sentiments of the Irish people, but he (the Chairman) could tell them that he had been through Ireland, and he never heard there but one voice—that they respected and loved the Irish Protestant clergy. When he sat in Parliament he was, as now, a defender of the Protestant Church in Ireland. He denied that it was the grievance of the Irish people. He was a Scotchman, and though not a Presbyterian, he respected the Presbyterian Church, and in Parliament had contended that it should remain in its unbroken strength. Through the carelessness and folly of the Parliament in 1844 that Church was split in two. If he, as a Scotchman, were to call public meetings, and proclaim treason against the Union, what would be said of him? It would be, “Poor gentleman, put him under the custody of his friends, and get him a quiet retreat.” To say that nations were moved by sentimental grievances was the idlest talk that ever fell from a man of talent. The people of Meath said the sole question of Ireland was the land question.

The Chairman then referred to Mr. Bright's statement, that it was a calamity that millions of Roman Catholics were directed in their ordinary and political conduct from the centre of Rome, and that there was no country under that influence so much as Ireland. He said that the real difficulty of Ireland was the deadly antipathy of a large portion of the people there to the people of England, and he referred to the risings of 1798 and 1803, and to the demonstrations made there in reference to the executions of the Fenians at Manchester. He concluded by asking, were they now—when the Union was rotting to its centre—going to inflict a blow on above a million of men who were faithful to England, devoted to her, and on whom the House of Commons had rained assaults, attacks, and reproaches, but who had remained, in spite of all, invariably loyal to England? These gentlemen in the House of Commons were going the way to break up the empire. Well and wisely had Mr. Carlyle said, "The last link of the Union is the Irish Church." Would they comply with those insane demands? As a lover of England, he said if they were going to have within six hours of their shores four millions and a half of men, led by fanatic priests, hating England, and detesting her heretical Prince and Crown, they were going to bring themselves down from all their greatness, and committing a most grievous blunder; and he thanked God that at least he could hold up his hand in an earnest protest against the selfish madness of politicians and the blindness of party.

The two Houses met again after the Easter recess on the 20th of April, and the 27th was appointed for resuming the proceedings in the House of Commons upon Mr. Gladstone's resolutions. Meanwhile, the question which engrossed the thoughts of all politicians, was brought up rather prematurely in the House of Lords by Lord Derby, who, without any formal motion before the House, called attention to Mr. Gladstone's resolutions, especially that which asked her Majesty to place at the disposal of Parliament her interest in the temporalities of the Irish Church. Fearing that the first of these resolutions, at all events, would be carried by a large majority, and reminding Earl Russell of the views he had enunciated last year on the Church question, he asked the noble earl whether he adhered to the opinion he had recently expressed, that any Minister who suddenly changed his opinions on an important political question was unworthy of the confidence of the country; and whether the supporters of Mr. Gladstone's resolutions intended to take steps for obtaining the concurrence of their lordships and the action of Parliament with respect to them. Having pointed out the similarity of the present state of things to that which existed in 1835, when the famous Appropriation Clause was carried through the House of Commons, Lord Derby expressed a hope that, no matter how factious was the opposition, the Government would allow nothing to induce them to abandon their duty towards their Sovereign and the country, of completing the work

of reform, and insisting that the voice of the newly-enlarged constituencies should be heard upon this most important question, and that they would give no countenance to a policy which could only introduce religious discord and animosity into Ireland, and must create a serious and irreconcilable difference between the two Houses of Parliament.

Earl Russell, considering that the House of Commons was on the point of deciding upon the resolutions, regarded the course now taken by Lord Derby as most extraordinary. To the charge of apparent inconsistency on his part he replied, as Mr. Burke once did in a similar situation, that the inconsistency of measures was not incompatible with the consistency of the end. One of the chief objects of his political life had been to establish peace and prosperity in Ireland, and he justified his approval of the resolutions whilst an inquiry was going on which he himself had moved by the fact that the inquiry was not of so extended a scope as he had asked. He hesitated not to say that he still had a preference for his own scheme of endowing the clergy of all persuasions in Ireland, but finding that this was now altogether impracticable, he had no chance but to vary the means in order to preserve the consistency of the end. To the question of the noble earl, Lord Russell replied that it was not intended to propose Mr. Gladstone's resolutions in their lordships' House. The better way would be, if they were carried through the Commons, to embody them in a Bill, for a Bill supported by a large majority of that House and the sympathy of the great bulk of the people would be far more likely to secure the assent of their lordships than any resolutions whatever. The noble earl also expressed a hope that the Government would not act upon Lord Derby's advice, for if they advised the Crown to resist the deliberate sense of the Commons, conveyed by a large majority, they would cause a collision between that House and the Crown such as had not been witnessed for many years. There was no intention, however, to ask the Crown to act upon the request of one House, but the resolutions would be followed by a Bill, and he trusted that, if the measure came up with the approval of a large majority, their lordships would have the patriotism and good sense to accept it.

A discussion ensued, in which several peers took part. Earl Granville protested strongly against the unusual course of proceeding adopted by Lord Derby. He was greatly surprised that any unofficial member of the House, however eminent, should put a question to another unofficial member, equally eminent, requiring him to state what were the views of members of the House of Commons upon questions then actually under their discussion. What would Lord Derby think if he asked him what course his late colleagues intended to take if the resolutions in question were passed by an overwhelming majority? He protested against the House of Lords being thus apparently made to pledge itself to fly in the face of the House of Commons and the country before a

single resolution had been passed by the other branch of the Legislature.

The Earl of Derby replied that, not being a member of the Government, he could not, of course, state what their conduct would be in the event referred to; but he had no hesitation in stating that he should advise them not to resign, as such a course, under present circumstances, would, in his opinion, be inconsistent with their duty to the Sovereign and the country.

The Earl of Malmesbury vindicated the course which had been taken by Lord Derby, and contended that it was within the province of any independent peer to bring any topic which he thought worthy of the attention of the House under its notice. The discussion then terminated.

The further proceedings upon the Irish Church question in both Houses of Parliament, which it occupied during a considerable portion of the remainder of the Session, will be narrated in the ensuing chapter.

CHAPTER IV.

THE IRISH CHURCH AND DISESTABLISHMENT—Further proceedings in Parliament in regard to this question—Prolonged Debate in the House of Commons on Mr. Gladstone's first Resolution condemnatory of the Establishment—It is ultimately carried by a majority of sixty-five in a full House—Mr. Disraeli asks for an adjournment to consider the Ministerial position, which is agreed to—Explanations are given in both Houses as to the interview of the Premier with her Majesty and the course proposed to be taken by the Government—The conduct of the Ministers is severely criticized by Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, Mr. Lowe, and other members—Much resentment is expressed at the threat of a Dissolution impending over the House of Commons, and at the use made of the Queen's name—Great Meeting of Bishops, Peers, and other eminent persons at St. James's Hall, to protest against disestablishment—Resolutions in defence of the Irish Church adopted with much enthusiasm—Mr. Gladstone proceeds with his second and third Resolutions in the House of Commons—They are carried under protest from the Conservative party, but without a division—Discussion respecting the Maynooth Grant, the Regium Donum, and endowments of other religious bodies—Declarations respecting the two former by Mr. Gladstone—Sharp discussions between the Prime Minister and Mr. Bright—Her Majesty's answer to the Address of the House respecting her rights of patronage in the Church of Ireland—The *Suspensory Bill* to prevent the filling up of vacant sees and benefices is brought in by Mr. Gladstone—Mr. Gathorne Hardy moves to postpone the second reading for six months—The Amendment is negatived by a majority of fifty-four, and the Bill is read a second time and passed through its remaining stages without difficulty—Principal provisions of the measure—Amendment respecting Maynooth College added on the motion of Col. Greville Nugent—The Bill meets with a different reception in the House of Lords, where the second reading is discussed with great animation for three nights—Remarkable display of eloquence and argument in this debate—Powerful speeches of Earl Granville, Lord Derby, Lord Carnarvon, Marquis of Salisbury, Duke of Argyll, Bishop of Oxford, and other Peers—Masterly defence of the Irish Church by the Lord Chancellor—The second reading is negatived on a division by 192 to 97—Result of this decision.

ALTHOUGH the division upon Lord Stanley's amendment mentioned in the preceding chapter had clearly shown what was the

predominant sentiment of the House of Commons upon the policy proposed by Mr. Gladstone in respect to the Irish Protestant Church, the supporters of that Establishment were by no means prepared to give up their cause as hopeless, or to accept without a further struggle the resolution condemnatory of its existence which the leader of the Opposition had undertaken to propose. The contest was resumed with much vigour after the Easter recess, and although the argument had been partially exhausted in the long debates which took place upon the motion for going into Committee, it required a further discussion of three nights' duration to bring the main issue, that of the cessation of the State Church as an Establishment, to a decision. It is true that the debate at times became somewhat languid, and at more than one period during its continuance the House was in danger of being counted out for want of a sufficient quorum, but there was a large number of members who desired to record their opinions or enunciate their protests on the question, and occasionally a speech was delivered which either from the position of the speaker or his being able to put a well-worn subject in a new light, gave some animation to the discussion, and sustained the flagging attention of the House. General Peel, who had seceded from the Ministry rather than concur in what he considered an unjustifiable dereliction from Conservative principles on the Reform question, and whose character for independence stood high in the House, obtained a favourable hearing on the subject now under discussion. He said that he regarded the resolutions as a party move, designed to re-unite the Liberal party, an object in which they seemed at present to be tolerably successful. Arguing that as long as the Act of Union was unrepealed the English and Irish Churches were one, and that this, therefore, was virtually an attack on the English Establishment, he warmly condemned both the inopportuneness and the substance of the resolutions. The transaction almost reconciled him to last year's Reform Bill, because no Parliament elected under household suffrage could be more inconsistent than this, and on this subject General Peel made some caustic remarks, recommending that the Treasury Bench should be sent to the British Museum, as the bench for the honour of sitting on which public men were ready to sacrifice every other honour, all consistency, and all statesmanship.

Mr. Horsman, after remarking that no one yet had ventured to defend the Irish Church as having done its duty as an Establishment, justified the Liberal party from the charge that they had neglected the question when in office, and were now precipitately intruding it for personal objects. It was the obstinacy of the Conservative Opposition, he said, which had prevented the settlement of this and other kindred questions, and he maintained that it had been first raised this Session by Lord Mayo's speech, suggesting the policy of "levelling-up." He entered, too, at length into the dispute between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Hardy,

vindicated the former from the charge of sudden and unexpected change of opinion, and by numerous quotations from newspapers and leading articles showed that he was understood in 1865 to have pronounced against the Irish Church. He confessed that at that time disestablishment seemed unlikely ever to be proposed by a Liberal Minister, but the question had come rapidly to the front, and for this the Conservative party were chiefly responsible by the fundamental change they had sanctioned last year. Nevertheless, had not the Government challenged them to it by their inadequate Irish programme and their policy of general endowment, he should have deprecated any sudden revival of the question. But now it had become necessary that the Liberal party should affirm their counter policy of universal disendowment and disestablishment, and for that purpose the three resolutions must be pressed and carried. To another accusation brought against the Liberal party, that they were only anxious to turn out the Government, Mr. Horsman replied in a vein of sarcastic banter by assuring the Ministry that their opponents were clear that they were best promoting disestablishment by keeping them in office. Of nine members of the Cabinet, eight were understood to be in favour of disestablishment, though the ninth—Mr. Hardy—obstinately refused as yet to bring his mind to it. With respect to the disestablishment of the Ministry, he believed there were no differences among them.

Mr. Adderley descanted on the vagueness of the resolution, which disestablished by a phrase and disendowed by an inference, and the motive for this, he remarked, was the necessity of bringing together those who would be scattered to the winds if Mr. Gladstone had ventured even on the outline of a definite plan. His chief supporters were the opponents of all Establishments, and the resolution sinned against the rule laid down by Mr. Gladstone himself, that no statesman ought to touch the question who was not prepared with a settlement of it. That there were grave anomalies in the Church was acknowledged by the Government as fully as by the Opposition, and they were as ready to deal with it when the Commission had reported. But the Opposition had recklessly disturbed the question before they were ready to deal practically with it. This was the action of an agitator, not of a statesman; but the agitation and not the settlement of great questions was the peculiar function of the Liberal party. Criticizing Mr. Gladstone's views, as declared in his two speeches, he pointed out that he was the first statesman who had proposed to alienate the religious property of the country, and pressed for some further explanations of the calculation by which he left the Anglican community in possession of three-fifths of the endowments.

The Marquis of Hartington held that we were bound in honour and in justice to leave no stone unturned to remove any admitted grievance of the Irish people. The abolition of the State Church in Ireland would be a message of peace to the Irish people, and he

entreated the party opposite not to withhold it. He asked them to meet their question with the modern weapons of argument, and not to bring from their armoury the mouldering weapons associated with the hateful cry of "No Popery."

Mr. Mowbray, in replying to the noble marquis, warned the House that the change which it was invited to make in the Constitution would be an infringement on the rights of the Crown, and an interference with the House of Lords. He was persuaded that the country would not endorse such a policy, and the Government were prepared to appeal with confidence to the new constituencies to reverse the decision which a majority of the expiring Parliament might be thoughtless enough to sanction.

Mr. Serjeant Sullivan reminded the House that changes similar to those which Mr. Mowbray predicted as unconstitutional and dangerous had already been effected in sweeping away ten Irish bishoprics.

Mr. Newdegate asserted that the proposition for the disestablishment of the Church had been put forward at the instigation of Cardinal Cullen and the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland, and that if it were carried into effect it would be impossible to maintain the union between the two countries.

Sir W. Heathcote opposed the resolution, expressing his belief that the Irish Protestants, finding themselves divested of the protection of the State, would raise the cry of religious equality all over the kingdom. The first resolution he considered amounted to simple confiscation; the second assumed to give the Queen a dispensing power, which could only be conferred by a statute.

Mr. Walpole opposed the resolution with much energy. He argued that the whole question of Church Establishments was ultimately involved in the present proceedings against the Irish Church. Admitting the abstract right of Parliament to deal with the Act of Union, he maintained that the article relating to religion was so stringent, and drawn with such peculiar care, that it required more than ordinary consideration before so solemn a stipulation was interfered with; and he contended that circumstances did not now exist to justify Parliament in setting it aside—a statement which he justified by an elaborate vindication of the Church of Ireland in reference to the purity of its doctrine, the learning of its prelates, and the loyalty which it inculcated. All that had made it a practical grievance had disappeared, and the removal of the Church would never give contentment so long as the land question remained unsettled. He required Mr. Gladstone to inform the House as to the details of his scheme—what was to be done with the surplus funds when all vested interests had been satisfied?—in what manner private property, secured under the same settlement as Church property, was to be dealt with? Instead of pacifying Ireland by an act of confiscation, he believed that it would alienate our best friends, would divide the people into hostile camps, and would put an end to the era of improvement

and tranquillity which, until the Fenian delusion broke out, seemed to have at last dawned upon Ireland.

Lord Elcho, in opposing the resolution, said that Mr. Gladstone had borrowed the traditional policy of the Liberals, of forcing on in opposition measures which they had neglected in office, and argued with great warmth and earnestness against the time and substance of the motion—which was part of the necessity of catching “the Irish vote.” As to disestablishment being an act of atonement, whatever might have been our sins in past days, our government of Ireland had recently been unselfish and beneficial. Refusing to argue this solely as an Irish question, he maintained that the logical result of the resolution would be the disestablishment both of the English and Scotch Churches.

Mr. Gladstone, in reviewing the course of the debate, remarked that it had turned upon extraneous points, and that no one had attempted to defend the Irish Church on its merits. But this was not surprising, for it never had and never could discharge the duty of an Establishment; it never had been nor could be more than the Church of a fraction. Reminding the House that two policies had been submitted to it, one of procrastination, the other of immediate action—for neither side denied that the present state of things was unendurable—he pointed out that Mr. Disraeli’s plan of joint endowment had been repudiated by members of his own Cabinet and by his followers. He declined distinctly to answer Mr. Walpole’s questions referring entirely to the details of a measure which could only be brought in by the Executive Government, and as he had not lightly undertaken the task, and should not shrink from any responsibility in connexion with it, he would not peril a great public interest by stepping now beyond the province of a private member. It was sufficient to say that the object of the motion was to do an act of justice to Ireland. Commenting on the charges of “conspiracy,” he remarked that had time permitted it would be easy to prove that the High Church party, which was represented to be plotting for this measure of disestablishment, was at the very moment working for Mr. Disraeli. But the supporters of the motion claimed to be in spontaneous alliance with the party all over the world which was striving to break down the system of religious ascendancy. Discussing the objections to the resolutions, he declared, with reference to the danger to the Church of England, that there was no reasonable ground for fearing it would be injuriously affected, for to remove a bad establishment was not to weaken a good one. As to the time, there were three grounds for moving in the question now. Public opinion had made a remarkable advance; the Government themselves had opened the question of the religious condition of Ireland; and the third reason was the state of Ireland itself, where peace was only secured by the exercise of the overwhelming power of England. To the objection that disestablishment would alienate the Protestants, he protested warmly against the doctrine of exclusive loyalty,

fed by exclusive privileges; and applying the experience of our colonial administration, he predicted that a policy of equal justice would develop the "British party" until it included every sane and intelligent man in Ireland. He criticized next, in terms of much severity, a recent speech of Lord Derby, declaring that he for one would not consent to take the word of command from the House of Lords, and concluded by urging the House, in an eloquent peroration, to accept the resolution, not as a panacea, but part of a policy which would add to the strength and glory of the empire.

Mr. Disraeli commenced his reply by stating that he objected to disestablishment—first, because it would be injurious to Ireland by reviving old animosities; and he remarked that hitherto no ground of objection had been taken to the Church but the abstract assertion that it was unjust to the people of Ireland. But he showed that it was not unjust to the whole people, and, being only a partial injustice, it was not susceptible of so easy a solution as total disendowment. Besides, its abolition might be equally unjust to other portions of her Majesty's subjects. He objected to it, too, because it interfered with the rights of property, and if this was to be done on the allegation that the Church did not fulfil the purposes for which it was created, the process could not stop there. The property of some of the great London companies, which certainly did not fulfil their original duties, would be in danger. It was impossible yet to predict what public opinion would pronounce upon the question; but the idea of the royal supremacy—our only security for religious liberty, and a great safeguard of our civil rights—was deeply rooted in the public mind of England, and it was upon such considerations as these, and not on a few local abuses, that the question of an Established Church must be judged. Mr. Disraeli concluded by explaining, in answer to some complaints made in the course of the debate, that he had not used the word "Romanist" in an offensive sense, and vindicated his statement as to the combination of Ritualists and Romanists.

The House then proceeded to a division, in which the numbers were as follows:—

For the Resolution	330
Against it	265

Majority against the Government .	65
-----------------------------------	----

The result of the division was received with considerable excitement, the increase upon the former majority on the House going into Committee, notwithstanding some accessions to the Ministerial strength in the mean time, indicating a further progress of opinion on the side of disestablishment. Mr. Disraeli, on the numbers being announced, rose and said that as the division had altered the relations of the Government with the House, it became necessary for the former to consider their position, and he accordingly proposed

an adjournment until the following Monday, the division having been taken at an early hour on the Friday morning. Mr. Gladstone briefly expressed his acquiescence in this course.

On the 4th of May explanations were given by the Ministers in both Houses as to the course proposed to be taken on the part of the Government. The Earl of Malmesbury, as their spokesman in the House of Lords, stated that there were constitutional precedents in favour of their dissolving Parliament under such circumstances; but on the other hand the Ministers were ready to tender, and they had tendered, their resignation to her Majesty, that she might, if she thought fit, consult other servants of the Crown. Her Majesty said she would take the subject into consideration, and on the following day informed the Prime Minister that she declined to accept the resignation of the Cabinet, but was prepared to dissolve the present Parliament whenever the state of public business would permit it. In answer to a question from Earl Grey as to the nature of the advice tendered to her Majesty by the Cabinet, the Lord Chancellor said the advice given was based on considerations having reference to the principles on which the present Parliament was elected. A graver and more important question had never been submitted to Parliament than that of the Irish Church, and it was now submitted to their decision, though when the present House of Commons was elected such a question was never in view—in fact, it had been stated by Lord Palmerston that the Irish Church would not be interfered with. He thought it must be admitted that the Parliament of 1865 was not, under these circumstances, fitted to express the opinion of the country on an appeal of such a kind.

Lord Grey vindicated the competence of Parliament to deal with any questions which might be brought before it, and utterly repudiated the idea as unconstitutional, that because a Parliament was elected before certain questions had arisen, it was therefore not qualified to decide on them.

The Lord Chancellor explained that he did not intend to question the competency of Parliament.

In reply to the Duke of Somerset, the Duke of Richmond said that the Government had made up their minds as to the course they intended to pursue, and repeated the statement made by Lord Malmesbury as to their being ready to dissolve Parliament whenever the state of public affairs enabled them to do so.

In the House of Commons the expectation of the Ministerial explanations attracted a very full attendance, both of members and of strangers. Every access to the House was crowded with persons anxious to witness the proceedings. The discussion which took place was characterized by much excitement of feeling, and occasionally by considerable warmth of language.

Mr. Disraeli prefaced his statement by referring to the circumstances under which the Government had taken office, to the successful carrying of the Reform Bill, to the success of the

Abyssinian Expedition and of the Government administration at home and abroad. He then repeated the grounds on which he had opposed the resolutions respecting the Irish Church ; and after some other prefatory remarks, he proceeded to state the details of his interview with the Queen. He said he had first of all, with the full concurrence of his colleagues, advised her Majesty to dissolve Parliament, but he at the same time placed the resignation of their offices at her Majesty's disposal. After taking time for consideration, the Queen, at a second interview, declined to accept his resignation, but signified her readiness to dissolve the present Parliament as soon as the state of public business permitted. Under these circumstances he advised the Queen that, if every effort were made to expedite public business, and the House of Commons would cordially co-operate with the Government, there might be a dissolution in the autumn of this year. The right hon. gentleman added that though he should emphatically negative the second and third resolutions, he would not enter into a protracted debate or formal division upon them, as they were corollaries from the first, and he would give Mr. Gladstone the first Government night to go on with the debate.

Mr. Gladstone, after briefly protesting against some of Mr. Disraeli's prefatory remarks, proceeded to protest emphatically against Mr. Disraeli's unconstitutional doctrine that every Minister carried in his pocket a right to dissolve a Parliament not elected under his influence. There were no precedents for inflicting such a penal dissolution except those set by the Governments of Lord Derby in 1852 and 1859 ; and to obtain such a right he maintained that two conditions were necessary—there should be an adequate necessity of public policy, and a reasonable prospect that the country would reverse the vote of the House of Commons. But in this case, as in 1852 and 1859, the Conservative Government had advised dissolution, not so much on any public interest as to determine the question of its own existence, and there was no precedent, he repeated, in which a Government had resorted to a dissolution against such overwhelming majorities. He pointed out, too, that though Mr. Disraeli had advised an immediate dissolution, he had not long ago denied the moral competence of the present constituencies to decide this question. The fate of the Government, in the first instance, was in its own hands, but the duty of the Opposition was clear—not to recede from the course on which it had entered, but to push on the resolutions, and to pass the Suspensory Act, which would not only declare the mind of the present Parliament, but prepare the way for the action of the next. On that point no compromise would be made with the Government ; but, accepting Mr. Disraeli's offer to give him the earliest possible night for resuming the debate, he should not move to postpone other business until the resolutions had been disposed of.

Mr. Lowe inferred from Mr. Disraeli's statement that the Queen had rejected both the alternatives he had laid before her—imme-

diate dissolution or resignation, and pointed out that no concession had really been made to the two great divisions. There was to be a dissolution next year just as there would have really been had the Irish Church question never been raised, and Parliament was asked to give a ten months' lease of office to a Government which neither trusted it nor was trusted by it.

Mr. Childers and other members pressed the Government with inquiries as to the mode in which they proposed to get over the difficulties arising from the process of registration of voters, so as to hold an election in the autumn.

Mr. Newdegate warmly approved of the decision of the Government, and protested against the attitude assumed by Mr. Gladstone.

Mr. Ayrton contended that Mr. Disraeli had, in an unconstitutional manner, attempted to shift the responsibility from the shoulders of the Cabinet upon the Crown.

Mr. Bouverie enforced Mr. Gladstone's protest against the doctrine that a Government could dissolve on the bare question of its own existence, and warned Mr. Disraeli that the unconstitutional course on which he was entering would lead to a renewal of the old conflicts between the Crown and the House of Commons. The dilemma into which the House was being driven was an inevitable result of government by a minority.

Mr. D. Griffiths cited the famous instance of Mr. Pitt, who, although in a minority in that House, appealed ultimately with complete success to the country upon the question of the existence of his government.

Mr. Bright, with much severity of tone and warmth of language, commented upon the humiliating attitude in which the Government was placed, and maintained that it was merely for the sake of prolonging his own term of office that Mr. Disraeli had made this outrageous demand on the indulgence of Parliament. But the Government had no right, he asserted, to a dissolution; and they had, therefore, no claim to remain in office where they could carry nothing of their own but a sixpenny income tax. No decent pretence had been offered for departing from the constitutional course of resigning after such signally adverse votes, for the Irish and Scotch Bills could be more easily passed by Governments really friendly to Reform, and the only result would be that the Irish Church could not be disestablished until 1870.

Mr. Disraeli, in reply to Mr. Lowe, said her Majesty had given her unqualified assent to a dissolution without any reference to old or new constituencies. He assured the House that the best legal authorities were clear that arrangements might be made for a dissolution in November, and if the Boundary Bill were passed early in June, he would bring in a short Bill which would facilitate the dissolution. To another remark of Mr. Lowe that the late division showed the House to have no confidence in the Government, he replied that many gentlemen who had voted in the majority had assured him that they did not regard it in that light, and he

challenged those who agreed with Mr. Lowe to propose a direct vote of want of confidence, which could be argued and decided on that plain issue.

The discussion here terminated for the present, but the Opposition party in the House, who were by no means satisfied with the position in which the House of Commons appeared to be placed in virtue of the discretion alleged to be given by the Crown to the Ministry of terminating the existence of the Parliament, recurred with increased warmth to the subject on the following evening, and endeavoured to extort from the Prime Minister a distinct explanation of the exact tenure on which both the House and the Cabinet actually stood in consequence of the recent communications with the Sovereign. Mr. Gladstone adverted to a speech made the evening before in the House of Lords by the Duke of Richmond, and said that from the Premier's first speech he (Mr. Gladstone) had gathered that the Queen had been the suggester, and not merely the acceptor or rejecter of the advice tendered by Ministers as to dissolution or resignation. But in his second speech the Premier, in his peculiar enigmatical manner, signified that the Queen had given her unqualified assent to a dissolution without reference to the old or new constituencies. This statement, Mr. Gladstone said, struck him at the time as most remarkable, and intended to cover some ulterior proceedings, and it had since received a significant illustration from the speech of the Duke of Richmond. In the first place he represented that the Premier had commenced his audience with the Queen by tendering his resignation, while Mr. Disraeli had told the House that resignation was only mentioned after the advice to dissolve. But the passages in the Duke of Richmond's speech to which Mr. Gladstone drew particular attention, and on which he animadverted with great force, were those in which he stated that in the case of any difficulties being thrown in the way of the Government the Queen would make no objection to a dissolution, and that whether the appeal were made to the old or new constituencies would depend upon the course of events, but that the consent of the Queen had been obtained to either. He asked the Premier whether he adopted this language, and whether it correctly described the position in which the House of Commons stood, condemned by anticipation if any of its votes should be displeasing to the Government?

Mr. Disraeli replied that there was not the smallest intentional difference between his first and second speeches, and repeated that at his audience with the Queen he had recommended a dissolution of Parliament, and that afterwards he had placed his resignation at her Majesty's disposal if she should be of opinion that it would conduce to a more satisfactory settlement of the Irish Church question. Answering a question which Mr. Bright here interposed, Mr. Disraeli said he had advised a dissolution without any reference to the consideration of old or new constituencies, and that the Queen ultimately expressed her readiness to dissolve

as soon as public business would allow, also without reference to that point. The question of the old and new constituencies had nothing to do with the original advice, although, of course, it was necessary afterwards to enter into these details; and he had expressed a hope that, with the concurrence of the House, the supplementary measures of Reform might be passed, and the appeal made to the new constituencies. As to the Duke of Richmond's speech, Mr. Disraeli said he had not read it; but as he was the Minister who had been in audience with the Sovereign, if the Duke of Richmond's account of it differed from his, the logical course would have been to ask the duke himself to explain the discrepancy.

Mr. Bouverie said that as Mr. Gladstone had not a seat in the House of Lords, he was obliged to ask an explanation in the Commons. Nothing could be more unconstitutional than to threaten a dissolution if the House displeased the Ministry.

Mr. Cardwell asked if the House was to deliberate as a free agent, or at the will and pleasure of the Government?

Sir S. Northcote said in answer that there was no intention on the part of the Ministers to hold over the House the threat of a dissolution.

Mr. Ayrton condemned the unjustifiable use made of the Queen's name, and the inconvenience of stopping all public business merely to gratify the ambition of the Premier.

Mr. Horsman repeated the questions—Had the Minister advised the Queen to appeal to the old or the new constituencies? Was he armed with a general power to dissolve, under the threat of which the House must deliberate for the rest of its existence? Mr. Whitbread pressed the same questions. Mr. Lowe, "for the third and last time," asked for a plain answer to the inquiry—Do the Government adopt the language of the Duke of Richmond?

Mr. Disraeli denied that he had been the first to introduce the Queen's name improperly into the discussion. All his references to her Majesty had been made in the spirit of the constitution and with her Majesty's permission. Complaining of the constant repetition of the question in a new form as fast as it was answered in another, and deprecating these attacks on the Government without notice, on the simple authority of newspaper extracts, he stated that his advice to her Majesty was confined entirely to the question of the Irish Church, and that her permission to dissolve was also confined to that question. If any other difficulty arose it would be necessary for him to seek another audience and to take the pleasure of her Majesty. To those who taunted the Government with not dissolving at once he pointed out the unprecedented circumstances of the case, and that every body knew it to be for the public interest that as wide an interpretation as possible should be given to the words "as soon as the state of public business will permit." Referring to a remark of Mr. Whitbread, he denied that the course he had indicated for the Government on the second and

third resolutions pledged them not to oppose the Bill Mr. Gladstone meant to bring in.

An appeal being made to the Speaker whether it was not irregular to refer to debates in the House of Lords, the right hon. gentleman answered, that though it was technically irregular to do so, exceptions were occasionally allowed when Ministerial explanations rendered it necessary. After some further remarks the discussion was brought to a close.

Previously to the proceedings on Mr. Gladstone's resolutions being resumed in the House a meeting of considerable importance from the rank and position of those who took part in it was held in the metropolis, for the purpose of protesting against the proposed measure of disestablishment. The Archbishop of Canterbury presided, supported by the Archbishops of York, Armagh, and Dublin, several English and Irish Bishops, a number of deans, and other dignified clergy, together with several leading members of the English peerage, members of the House of Commons, and other eminent individuals.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in opening the proceedings, said the meeting was not assembled for the purpose of debate, but to hear speakers on the union of Church and State, therefore no amendment could be admitted. He disclaimed any party views in taking the chair. The cause of the union of Church and State was supported by all sections of the Church, except, perhaps, by a very small number, who refused to listen to any authority. He did not come there believing that the Church was in danger. The Church was founded on an imperishable Rock—the Rock of Ages—and the gates of hell had never yet prevailed against it. A great living statesman who wrote thirty years ago declared that the union of Church and State was in conformity with the will of God, and was essential to the advancement of the best interests of Christianity. Persons who said that the disestablishment of the Irish Church had nothing to do with the Church Establishment in England grievously deceived themselves. The chief promoters of the late measure were not of that opinion, as was shown by a passage in the "Nonconformist" paper, to the effect that the Irish Church will not be disposed of before the public will be prepared to consider a similar measure in regard to the English Church. His Grace concluded by saying, "May God avert that evil day, and perpetuate the union between Church and State, which is so eminently conducive to the welfare of our country!"

The Lord Mayor of London moved, "That this meeting is of opinion that the union of Church and State ought to be maintained as affording the best means for the promotion of religion and morality amongst the people, and as important alike for the welfare of the State and for the efficiency of the Church."

The Bishop of Oxford seconded the resolution. The Bishop of London moved the next in these terms: "That this meeting believes that the proposed disestablishment and disendowment of

the Irish branch of the United Church of England and Ireland would be a serious blow to the Reformed Faith in the United Kingdom, and would directly tend to promote the ascendancy of a foreign power within her Majesty's dominions." He supported the resolution in a brief speech, and concluded by saying "he had no more fear of the predominance of the Roman Catholic religion in England than of the revivification of any phantom of the past."

The Earl of Harrowby seconded the resolution, which was supported also by the Archbishop of York, and was carried.

The Dean of Westminster moved, and the Earl of Colchester seconded, a third resolution which was also passed, which affirmed, "That this meeting earnestly desires that all changes in the Irish branch of the United Church of England and Ireland which shall upon fair examination be found necessary shall be carried out; but it believes that the measures now contemplated will work great wrong, and will utterly fail of their professed object, namely, the securing of good-will and harmony throughout Ireland."

The proceedings of this meeting were referred to in the House of Commons on the following day, when it went into Committee in order to proceed with the second and third resolutions moved by Mr. Gladstone. The right hon. gentleman, adverting to this demonstration of opinion of the dignitaries of the Church, observed that while he regretted that many eminent persons did not agree with the course which he felt it his duty to pursue, he could not on account of that disapprobation disregard the fact that the majority of this House, in the course which they pursued respecting the Irish Church, were warmly supported by the general judgment of the country. The right hon. gentleman then moved his second resolution: "That, subject to the foregoing considerations (the preservation of vested rights), it is expedient to prevent the creation of new personal interests by the exercise of any public patronage, and to confine the operations of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of Ireland to objects of immediate necessity, or such as involve individual rights, pending the final decision of Parliament." Its general object, he explained, was to give immediate and practical effect, as far as time would admit, to a general declaration of opinion, and he anticipated that even those who considered modifications of the Irish Church were sufficient without going so far as disestablishment, would not object to prevent the creation of the new vested interests until those modifications could be made. In the Bill which he intended to bring in he should propose to suspend the power of making episcopal, capitular, or parochial appointments till the 1st of August, 1869. No great inconvenience he believed would be sustained by this measure, as there were provisions in the Church Temporalities Act, by the application of which arrangements might be made for the performance of the duties. The resolution did not apply to livings under private patronage. There were but few of them in Ireland, the bulk of the livings in that country being in the patronage of the bishops or of the Crown.

Mr. Hardy, on behalf of the Government, said that they could not assent to the resolution, yet, admitting that they had sustained as severe a defeat as ever had befallen a Government, and for the sake of bringing the business of the Session to a close, they did not intend to divide against it. But this would not prevent them opposing the Suspensory Bill, on which their policy would be declared when it appeared. He remarked, however, that nothing was said in the resolutions to prevent the creation of new vested interests in the Maynooth Grant and the *Regium Donum*.

After some observations from Mr. Newdegate, Sir F. Heygate, and Mr. Whalley, the resolution was put from the chair, and declared to be carried amidst much cheering from the Opposition. Mr. Gladstone then moved his third resolution as amended by him, which was in these terms: "That an humble address be presented to her Majesty, humbly to pray that, with a view to preventing, by legislation during the present Session, the creation of new personal interests through the exercise of any public patronage, her Majesty would be graciously pleased to place at the disposal of Parliament her interest in the temporalities of the archbishoprics, bishoprics, and other ecclesiastical dignities and benefices in Ireland, and in the custody thereof." He described it as a sequel to the second, and as simply formal; for though it would be competent to introduce a Bill (but not to pass it), he thought it but respectful, on a matter affecting so important a right of the Crown, to obtain the royal consent before bringing in a Bill.

Mr. Disraeli, in reply to a question from Mr. D. Griffith as to what answer he would advise to be given to the address, said he had not understood Mr. Gladstone to make any assumption as to the character of the answer he would receive, or whether he would receive any answer at all. If the address were adopted it would be the duty of the Government to consider it, and properly to advise her Majesty upon it.

This resolution was also agreed to without further debate. A long and warm discussion then took place upon several motions which were made by various members, for the purpose of defining the status of other religious bodies in Ireland who received aids or contributions from the State. An animated debate first arose upon a resolution proposed by Mr. Sinclair Aytoun in these terms, that "when the Anglican Church in Ireland is disestablished and disendowed, the grant to Maynooth and the *Regium Donum* shall be discontinued; and that no part of the secularized funds of the Anglican Church, or any State funds whatever, be applied in any way, or under any form, to the endowment or furtherance of the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland, or to the establishment or maintenance of Roman Catholic denominational schools or colleges."

Mr. Bright warmly opposed this resolution, chiefly on account of its abstract character, which would in no way pledge any future

Parliament. He argued also, that, if fully carried out, it would destroy the denominational system in Ireland.

Sir James Fergusson insisted that the disposal of the funds to be taken from the Irish Church was an all-important branch of the subject, on which the House had a right to be fully informed, but he suggested the omission from the motion of the part relating to the *Regium Donum* and the Maynooth Grant.

Sir George Grey pointed out that the resolution would involve very embarrassing consequences, as it would put a stop to grants to denominational schools, and for Roman Catholic army and gaol chaplains. "Why," he asked, "should the Roman Catholics alone be placed under such a ban?"

Mr. Gladstone repeated, with marked emphasis, his declaration made in a former debate, that the Maynooth Grant and the *Regium Donum* must both be abolished, but he strongly protested against pledging the House before the time to opinions to which practical effect could not be given. Great confusion and danger to the important enterprise on which the House was engaged would result from straying away from the main point, and more particularly he objected to voting for a resolution which singled out one particular form of religion, and stigmatized it with special condemnation.

An amended resolution was moved, after some further discussion, by Mr. Whitbread, the purport of which was confined to a simple condemnation of the *Regium Donum* and the Maynooth Grant. Upon a division, Mr. Aytoun's resolution was negatived by 198 to 85, all the Cabinet Ministers leaving the House and declining to vote. Mr. Gladstone proposed an addition, which was adopted, reserving all vested personal interests. Mr. Greeve then moved to add further words declaring that no part of the endowment of the Irish Church should be applied to institutions of any other religious body.

Mr. Bright repeated his objections to such a declaration on the part of the present Parliament, and after a discussion marked by considerable warmth the proposed addendum was negatived by 132 to 97. A remark of Mr. Disraeli that the events of the evening proved that those who had introduced the resolutions had aroused the elements of strife and confusion in the country, provoked a very sharp rejoinder from Mr. Bright, who retorted that the events of the evening showed how little chance of success Mr. Disraeli's policy of endowing the Roman Catholic Church was likely to have. "The right hon. gentleman the other night, with a mixture of pompousness and sometimes of servility, talked at large of the interviews which he had had with his Sovereign. I venture to say that a Minister who deceives his Sovereign is as guilty as the conspirator who would dethrone her. I don't charge the right hon. gentleman with deceiving his Sovereign. But if he has not changed the opinions which he held twenty-five years ago, and which in the main he said only a few weeks ago were

right, then I fear he has not stated all that it was his duty to state in the interview he had with his Sovereign. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite, and the right hon. gentleman in particular, that any man in this country who puts the Sovereign in the front of a great struggle like this into which it may be we are about to enter—who points to the Irish people and says from the floor of this House that ‘your Queen holds the flag under which we, the enemies of religious equality and justice to Ireland, are marshalled’—I say the Minister who does that is guilty of a very high crime and great misdemeanour against the Sovereign and against his country, and there is no honour, there is no reputation, there is no glory, there is no future name that any Minister can gain by conduct like this, which will acquit him to posterity of one of the most grievous offences against his country which a Prime Minister can possibly commit.”

Lord John Manners, in answer to Mr. Bright, denied that the Government had ever contemplated the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church, and he taunted him with having joined in a vote which retained the power of transferring the property of the Protestant to the Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. Gladstone read, for Lord John Manners' information, a passage from Lord Mayo's speech, in which, he contended, the policy of endowing the Roman Catholic clergy was clearly foreshadowed. He put a different construction on the vote just given, maintaining that the effect of the proposal against which Mr. Bright had voted would be to perpetuate religious inequality. As to Mr. Disraeli's language, he had never heard such from a Prime Minister before.

Mr. Disraeli repeated that the history of the evening was an indication of the confusion which existed on this question, and vindicated his language as sensible and appropriate to the occasion. Turning to Mr. Bright, he indignantly defied him to put his insinuations into the shape of a formal charge, and appealed with confidence to the verdict of “gentlemen” on both sides.

This brought an unusually stormy scene to a close, and the question being put from the chair, the last resolution of Mr. Gladstone was finally adopted by the House.

The answer of her Majesty to the address presented in pursuance of the resolutions was anticipated with some anxiety. It was thought by some who were opposed to the scheme of disestablishment, and who had regarded the address itself as an objectionable interference with the prerogatives of the Crown, that her Majesty might be advised to return an answer unfavourable to the wishes of the majority of the House of Commons. Such an expectation, however, was disappointed by the result, her Majesty having on this, as on all occasions, followed the constitutional course in not placing the royal prerogative in conflict with the desires of Parliament. The answer of the Crown on this occasion was given as follows:—

“I have received your address, praying that, with a view to

preventing by legislation, during the present Session, the creation of new personal interests through the exercise of my public patronage, I would place at the disposal of Parliament my interest in the temporalities of the archbishoprics, bishoprics, and other ecclesiastical dignities and benefices in Ireland and in the custody thereof. Relying on the wisdom of my Parliament, I desire that my interest in the temporalities of the United Church of England and Ireland, in Ireland, may not stand in the way of the consideration by Parliament of any measure relating thereto that may be introduced in the present Session."

Mr. Gladstone thereupon moved for leave to bring in a Bill to prevent for a limited time new appointments in the Irish Church, and to restrain for the same period the proceedings of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Ireland. The motion at first met with some opposition from Col. S. Knox and Mr. Vance, but was agreed to by the House, and the Bill was brought in on the 14th of May. The Second Reading was moved upon the 23rd, with a short speech from Mr. Gladstone, who said that at the opening of the Session, Government coincided with the members of the Opposition in the opinion that it was not desirable to maintain the present ecclesiastical condition of Ireland, and that equality should be established; but they proposed to effect this by giving, and not by taking away,—the meaning of which was to establish by means of public funds other endowments than those which now existed. He, on the contrary, was for bringing about religious equality by disestablishment and general disendowment, by the repeal of the Maynooth Act, and the discontinuance of the *Regium Donum*. In disestablishing the Church of Ireland he, and those who acted with him, emphatically disavowed the idea of establishing any other religious communion, and they finally abandoned for Ireland the maintenance in any form of a salaried or stipendiary clergy. The Bill was a necessary consequence of the second resolution, and if they were to carry the resolutions which the House had agreed to by a large majority into effect, it was imperative to prevent embarrassments by putting a stop to the creation of new vested interests. That was the object of the Bill. Some members had appealed to him not to proceed with the Bill, when he was aware there was no chance of its passing the House of Lords. But they ought not to be governed in their rejection or adoption of a measure by doubts or misgivings which any of them might entertain as to the judgment which might be arrived at by another branch of the Legislature.

Mr. Gathorne Hardy moved that the Bill be read on that day six months. He denied that the Government made religious equality the basis of their policy. They proposed to give a charter to the Roman Catholic University in Ireland, but the head of the Government had distinctly stated that no intention had ever existed of paying the Roman Catholic clergy, and he would add that the subject of the *Regium Donum* was never dis-

cussed in the Cabinet in any shape or form. This was the first Bill that had been introduced into this House avowedly for the confiscation of Church property and devoting it to secular purposes. He did not deny that Parliament had the power to deal with this matter, but he said, on the authority of a lawyer of eminence, that by this Bill they were in effect repealing the Union. He objected to the Bill because it was inexpedient, because it was an attempt to paralyze the action of the Church in Ireland before any real decision had been come to with regard to it, because it was unjust to the clergy, because it was monstrously unjust to stop the operations of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, part of whose function was to increase the endowment of poor livings; and because this attack on the Church of Ireland was only a preliminary to an attack on the Church of England. Mr. Lowe, speaking of the Irish Establishment, had said, "Cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?" He, on the contrary, said, "Let it alone for this year also." He concluded by applying to the Bill a sentiment uttered by the late Bishop of London when speaking against the Appropriation Clause in 1835, that "a measure commenced with spoliation and sacrilege must end in ruin and confusion."

The debate was continued by Mr. Lawson, Mr. Liddell, Sir F. Heygate, Lord Elcho, and other members.

Mr. W. E. Forster contended not only for the religious but for the political equality of Ireland, and called on the Premier either to disavow or to endorse the language of Lord Mayo when declaring the Irish policy of the Government.

Mr. Disraeli said the question had now assumed a different aspect, inasmuch as Mr. Gladstone had announced that none of the sequestrated revenues of the Irish Church should be devoted to any religious communion. He was opposed both to the old and new policy of the right hon. gentleman. What were the charges against the Secretary for Ireland? It was alleged that he stated they proposed to endow a Roman Catholic University. The correspondence on the table proved they never intended to do any such thing. Neither was it true that his noble friend said they proposed to endow the Roman Catholic clergy, and he himself at the time expressed an adverse opinion to it. Then it was said that his noble friend advocated religious equality; but that was a vague charge. Neither had it ever occurred to them to increase the *Regium Donum*, though his noble friend had said the *Regium Donum* was a miserable pittance. They were asked to establish political and religious equality in Ireland. But the Irish people consisted of several races and religions; and if they adopted a measure which satisfied one, they dissatisfied the other. This was the first step to disestablish the Church in England; it would bring about a crisis in England, and disturb the social system of this country. He had been accused of raising the cry of "No Popery." He had not raised that cry, but he had heard a cry of

"No Protestantism," which was new in this country. He believed that Mr. Gladstone had entered into a dangerous controversy, and that the consequences might be very serious; that they might dim the splendour of the British Crown, and lower the character of the people of England.

Mr. Gladstone, in reply, said it was not usual for members of the Cabinet to excuse themselves in that House by stating what had or had not been discussed in the Cabinet. They had nothing to do with that; but they had to do with expressions used in the House by one member of the Cabinet in the hearing of, and uncontradicted by, his colleagues. The Earl of Mayo had said, "There would be no objection to make all Churches equal, but that result must be secured by elevation, and not by confiscation." If there was meaning in words, that meaning was concurrent endowment. His own counter-project was to overthrow the endowment which now existed. He denied that there was in this any danger to the English Church. On the contrary, he believed that the existence of the Irish Church was a danger to the Church of England and to Protestantism.

The Earl of Mayo explained the statements he made use of on the occasion referred to. There had been an elevation of the other Churches going on in Ireland by the increase of the *Regium Donum* and of the Maynooth Grant, very much to the benefit of the country, and what he said was that that process was a very salutary one; but he denied that he had proposed any endowment of the Roman Catholic clergy.

Upon a division the numbers were as follows:—

For the second reading	312
Against it	258
	<hr/>
Majority*	54

The provisions of the "Suspensory Bill," as it was called, were to the following effect. After reciting that her Majesty had placed her interest in the temporalities of the Church of Ireland at the disposal of Parliament, and that it was expedient to prevent the creation of new personal interests, the Bill provided that in the event of any vacancy occurring in any dignity or benefice no successor should be appointed, and that the income should be held by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to be disposed of as Parliament might direct. In the case of benefices becoming vacant the Commissioners were authorized to provide for the spiritual wants of the suspended benefice, and to regulate the salary of the officiating minister, according to the nature and extent of the duties to be discharged. They were to make no grants for the building or repairing of any church or glebe. All these provisions were to remain in force until the 1st of August, 1869. In the case of bishoprics and other dignities the persons designated by the Irish Church Temporalities Act of 1833 were to be the guardians of the

spiritualities. The bill contained no provisions whatever touching the Coronation Oath or the Act of Union. It dealt with episcopal, capitular, and parochial appointments alone. It did not deal with private endowments, nor with livings under private patronage, of which there were, however, very few in Ireland, almost all being under the patronage of the Crown or of the bishops. The bill was, in short, strictly limited to the requirements of the case at the time. It contained only five sections.

The measure, of which the principle had been affirmed by so decided a majority, passed with but little discussion through the House of Commons; the only amendment of any importance was one relating to the College of Maynooth, proposed by Mr. Ayrton, the effect of which would have been to cut off at once all government support from the College of Maynooth. Mr. Gladstone took exception to this as going too far, and carrying out in regard to this institution a procedure which was not to be applied to the Established Church. Another amendment, moved by Colonel Greville Nugent, providing that every person appointed to any office in Maynooth College after the passing of the Act, should hold the same subject to the pleasure of Parliament, was adopted, and a corresponding provision was made with respect to the recipients of the *Regium Donum*. With these modifications the Bill was passed.

In the House of Lords the measure met with a different reception. The question of disestablishment was discussed on the motion for the second reading of the Suspensory Bill at great length and with remarkable ability. The defence of the Irish Church was sustained by the Conservative peers with an energy and force which contrasted remarkably with the rather lukewarm style in which the speeches on the Ministerial side, with the signal exception of that of Mr. Gathorne Hardy, had dealt with the question. The lords' debate, it was generally admitted, exhibited on both sides a display of eloquence and a power of reasoning, applied to the fundamental principles of the question, which reflected great honour on that assembly. The speeches of which we shall now give a brief and imperfect summary, which is all that our limits will permit, were of a high order of ability, and furnish a complete repertory of argument and information upon this controversy.

Earl Granville, who moved the second reading of the Bill on the 25th June, began by observing that the recent outbreak of Fenianism had shown the necessity of a policy for Ireland both of firmness and of conciliation. Lord Mayo's suggestions respecting a Catholic University indicated that her Majesty's Government felt the necessity as well as the Opposition. He proceeded to vindicate Mr. Gladstone from the charge of having concocted a hastily devised scheme for the purpose of stealing a political advantage. After arguing that the present Bill was a necessary preliminary to further legislation, he proceeded to defend on the

grounds of history, reason, and right, the propriety of putting an end to an institution which was unjust both as the Church of a minority and as not the Church of the poor. He denied with emphasis that this was an attempt to lay hands on "sacred" property. Such was not the opinion of Bishop Butler or of Archbishop Whately. When, he asked, was this property dedicated? By the Act of Henry VIII., who took it from the Roman Catholics, or by that of Queen Mary, who restored it? He denied, again, that the right of property would be affected by interference with property acquired and held as was this. Nor was the cause of the Established Church of Ireland the cause of the English Establishment. On the contrary, the separation of the two would be advantageous to the latter. Then it was objected that the Irish people itself did not care for this relief. This was not likely, and it was not the fact. It was argued against a moderate Reform Bill introduced by a Liberal Ministry that the people were apathetic; and what sort of a measure did the next year see? He passed lightly over other arguments against the Bill, based severally on references to the Coronation Oath, on the personal sentiments of her Majesty, the supposed danger to the Act of Union, and the imaginary injustice to the poor of secularizing ecclesiastical funds. The argument that to touch the Irish Establishment would be fatal to the Protestantism of Europe he thought might be disposed of by reference to the conduct of the Protestant communities of Continental Europe themselves. It did not follow that disestablishment would injure the Irish Church itself. Disestablishment in Canada, besides confirming the loyalty of that country, as to which he quoted a letter of Mr. D'Arcy M'Gee, had greatly promoted the prosperity of the Episcopal Church there. In conclusion, he appealed to the House, by at least allowing the Bill to proceed to a second reading, to show its readiness to give it a grave consideration.

Lord Grey justified his taking from the hands of the Government the task of moving that the Bill should be read that day six months on the ground that it was desirable this should not appear a mere party vote. His own belief had ever been that the existence of the Irish Church was a gross injustice; but he thought the present proposition to suspend the filling up of ecclesiastical vacancies was not the right mode of remedying that injustice or even of carrying out the end proposed by the advocates of the present measure. He argued that machinery which at present did not exist in the Established Church, and which this Bill did not attempt to provide, ought to be first created with reference to the disposal of property such as, for instance, the proceeds of private munificence, which it was conceded on all hands must be left to the Episcopal Church in Ireland. The present proposed course was unjust and needlessly offensive. What was not to be done was explained, but not what was to be done. Still further, he complained of the policy by which a measure of this kind, which it was especially expedient to reserve for calm deliberation, had been made the occasion of a

great party fight, and he vehemently deprecated advocating its acceptance by appeals to the fear of Fenianism. This vast and difficult question, which involved the gravest religious changes, could be settled only by a compromise between different parties, or by doing away with all religious endowments. He was himself in favour of a compromise, for he was convinced that religious peace, which ought to be the object of any measure, would certainly not be furthered by throwing the ministers of religion wholly on the liberality of their congregations. But he regretted the introduction of the Bill, particularly as forcing the Government to make up their minds hastily, and thus tending to raise an additional obstacle to the final settlement of this question, which he was of opinion did require settlement by well-considered and thorough legislation.

Lord Clarendon showed that Lord Grey had formerly used a very different tone in speaking on this subject. On the merits of the question, he argued that if we had a *tabula rasa* to fill up we should never at this date think of erecting such an institution as the Irish Establishment, and that there was no sufficient reason for our not removing it now if it were an injustice. What a scandal it must be in the eyes of unfriendly foreigners might be imagined from criticisms, to which he referred, by friendly foreigners. He called for the measure as required by the state of public feeling in Ireland. This reform would not at once cure rancour, the growth of centuries, but it would be a step in that direction, and, indeed, whatever its expediency, it was demanded by our conscience. The Liberal party had been taunted with not having brought forward this question when in office. If they had they would have been reviled as traitors. But the Conservative party had passed through a process of development since then. After reviewing and disposing finally of several objections to the Bill, he deprecated its rejection, which he anticipated, as well because he foresaw the acceleration which it would lend to feeling on this special subject as from regard to its effect upon the reputation of that House, which it was peculiarly important to maintain in view of the coming House of Commons.

The Archbishop of Canterbury said that he had always been a supporter of Catholic Emancipation, but he denied the justice or the expediency of concessions like that now demanded. It was the land question which engrossed almost exclusive interest in Ireland.

Lord Derby, who began by apologizing on the ground of infirm health, but spoke with great animation, after criticizing the conduct and motives of Mr. Gladstone, denied the moral competency of Parliament to carry such a measure of spoliation as had never been accomplished, except in the case of the monasteries, against ecclesiastical property in this country. If a certain length of possession gave a title to private property, prescription reaching far beyond the Reformation ought surely to insure tranquil possession to the Church of Ireland, unless indeed the old maxim, *Nullum*

tempus occurrit Ecclesie, must be read backwards. On the principle on which this Bill was supported, the property of the great City Companies might be equally confiscated; and as for the qualification that, at all events, Parliament might take away what Parliament had given—in the first place, Parliament could not properly take away what it had given (else Blenheim and Strathfieldsaye were not safe), and, in the second place, Parliament did not give the Church of Ireland its property. But what, he asked, was the Roman Catholic grievance which called for so violent a remedy as this? The Catholics in Ireland had at present equality, unless equality implied equality of possessions. They had, in fact, every thing they wanted, except their neighbours' goods. The present movement was, in fact, due to a strange combination of Catholics and of enemies of all religious endowments. How novel a view it was that such a disendowment could be legitimate he showed by quotations from Lords Plunkett, Palmerston, and Grey, and Mr. Gladstone. After adverting to the special difficulties of a gradual disestablishment, and to the impropriety of calling on her Majesty to act in direct opposition to the terms of her Coronation Oath, he dilated on the positive evils which would result from depriving Ireland of the class of resident gentry supplied now by the clergy, and the substitution of a more intemperate ministry. It would be a conclusion dangerous to England, and inconsistent with the preservation of the Union; but to Ireland it would be fatal. He warned the House not to shrink from deciding as it thought right from the fear of a conflict which it had not provoked with the other House, or with a current of public feeling of which he doubted the existence.

The Bishop of London explained certain expressions of his which had been construed as imputing unworthy motives to the author of the Bill. He denied that this Bill was founded on the precedent of that of 1833, or of any other Suspensory Bill, and showed that the present Bill would entirely stop the action of the Church wherever a vacancy occurred. But his main objection was that there was not before them any scheme of disestablishment. When there was, their lordships would doubtless consider it carefully; but at present, besides discovering numerous difficulties in the way of forming such a scheme, he could not discover the need for it, or, indeed, among moderate Irish Catholics the desire for it. Peace was what Ireland required. The Irish Church Establishment might be modified with advantage; but to destroy it would be to hand over Ireland altogether to the Roman Catholic Church, and to bring on the repeal of the Union.

The Earl of Carnarvon (being one of those Ministers who had seceded from Lord Derby's Cabinet on the Reform question) made an able speech in support of the Bill. He said he regretted that the question had been mixed up with party politics. Without impugning the motives of the promoters of the Bill he attributed their action to the policy of the Government in placing in the van

a reckless scheme to establish a Roman Catholic University and making proposals for "levelling up." In his opinion it would be safer for the Irish Church, whilst still unbroken by defeat, to come to terms with her declared opponents than to trust to false friends. A cry had now been raised that the Church of England was in danger. Nothing could be more wanton, reckless, and even criminal than the course taken by Government in binding up the English and Irish Churches. Nothing could be more widely different than the positions of these two institutions. The one expands on all sides and reigns in the hearts of the people, but nothing of that sort can be said of the other. The noble earl then proceeded to show that the Irish Church had failed in its functions, and said no one could think it just to make Episcopacy in Scotland or Protestantism in France the Established Churches of those countries. And if, which God forbid! the members of the Church of England were to dwindle down to an eighth of the population, it would be manifestly unjust that they should retain their predominance. The noble earl concluded by saying, that although he should not have brought forward this measure, yet, having it before him, he could not take the responsibility of rejecting it.

The Marquis of Salisbury, who had quitted Lord Derby's Administration at the same time as Lord Carnarvon, adopted a different conclusion as to this question. He said he inferred from the very exceptional character of this Bill, which would throw the whole ecclesiastical system of Ireland into disorder, that the design of it was to prejudice the question when it should come before the future House of Commons. The Bill was said to leave three-fifths of the Irish Church's property to it. But it left this only to the clergy. To the Church the measure was one of complete spoliation, as sweeping as human or radical ingenuity could devise, and the principle of which would apply equally to Wales or Cornwall. It was not the less unjust that it dealt with national property, for the principle on which some property was supposed capable of being dealt with by the State he held to be simply evolved from the depths of a "liberal" consciousness. No case of trusts unfulfilled had been made out; and the solitary plea for the confiscation was that others coveted the Church funds. On the highest ground, then, of justice to the Irish Church and to the Irish Protestants, who had always been loyal, but whose loyalty might not be proof against so ungenerous a return, he called on the House, without paying regard to arguments about Fenianism, or to threats of the consequences of differing from the House of Commons, to reject so crude and violent and so objectless a measure.

The Archbishop of Armagh declared that the Bill would throw the whole ecclesiastical system in Ireland into confusion, and that it would prove especially unjust to the poorer clergy, by taking away the episcopal patronage, which was their peculiar resource. The disestablishment, of which this was the preliminary, was, he earnestly contended, a violation of Lord Castlereagh's compact—

acquiesced in by the Catholics themselves—on which the Union was based; and was peculiarly ill-timed now, when the Irish Church was working with unprecedented zeal and success, as, indeed, sufficiently appeared from the difference in the proportion of Churchmen now to what he showed it was in the time of Sir William Petty. If the progress had not of old been equally great, let the civil policy answer for it. The State had systematically discountenanced proselytizing. It had countenanced the spoliation of the Church. It was said that the Irish Church was the Church of an eighth part of the population. Yes, and it possessed but an eighth part of the tithes. Whatever it had done it had been left to do by itself; and even a great part of its actual income came from the gift of James I. of 111,000 acres for the promotion of the Protestant faith and the benefactions of individual Irishmen. He concluded by a solemn appeal against a measure dangerous to the interests of the Empire and the Royal supremacy, and which would embarrass, though it could not destroy, the Protestant Church of Ireland.

Lord Dufferin advocated the second reading, not as representing his party, but as an Irishman and a Churchman. He thought the charges of the inutility of the Irish Church Establishment and its injustice and offensiveness to the Catholics of Ireland had been fully made out, and he demanded a remedy for a state of things which now made it hard even for the Heir to the Throne to visit part of her Majesty's dominions without complications and embarrassments.

The Archbishop of York dwelt upon the impracticability of working the Irish Church if the House passed this Suspensory Bill, which, he warned their lordships, by reference to other Suspensory Bills, might, though stated to be for a year, last in operation for many years. He attacked the measure as making no proper provision for discipline in the case of vacancies of sees and parishes; as a spoliation of the Protestant laity, whose wrongs no one seemed to have regarded; and as in its financial arrangements unjust and ungenerous. Its advocates did not claim for it that it would do much good, and he could tell them that it would do a great deal of harm. The Irish Church had abuses; but it had had a very difficult part to play, and might eradicate them as the Church of England had eradicated many of its own abuses.

Lord Shaftesbury was vehemently opposed to the disestablishment of the Irish Church. He, moreover, considered the Bill feeble, meagre, and insignificant. But he feared that its rejection on the eve of an election might be used to induce a feeling that the House was opposed to a full inquiry on this subject, and might thus prove injurious to the Irish Church. He concluded by announcing his intention, out of regard to the opinion of friends, of taking no part in the division.

The Duke of Argyll supported the Bill with a speech of great argumentative force. He said that he gladly accepted

from a Ministry which had abandoned its party standard, and from Lord Grey, the type of crotchety politicians, the reproach that the disestablishment of the Irish Church had been brought within the domain of party questions out of the region of abstract speculation. He defended the Bill on the ground of economy of the funds of the Irish Church. This was its object. Members of the other House who had voted for the first Resolution might consistently hereafter vote against a measure of disendowment, and Peers who voted for this Bill might consistently vote even against any future measure of disestablishment. Nor would this Bill kill the Irish Church by inches by means of continual extensions. It would, in all probability, insure a speedy compromise among religious parties in Ireland, and, at all events, could not be extended without the consent of this House. As to its origin, he denied the cogency of the accusations against the late Ministry for not having brought forward this question of the Irish Church while absorbed by the question of Reform; and he thought that the Fenian conspiracy, though not connected directly with the Irish Church, was a most proper occasion for the Legislature to show that its conscience had been awakened as to the necessity of diminishing the traditional disaffection which was the *pubulum* of Fenianism. The present Government, as represented by the Secretary for Ireland, had itself evinced a sense of the necessity of doing something. But it had done nothing. The occupants of the episcopal bench, with the *esprit de corps* existing between all Established Churches, had adopted the ecclesiastical motto, "*Non possumus.*" Hence the task was forced on the Liberal party. And in the plan it had chosen he was convinced it had decided rightly in not attempting to effect that for which, independently of other objections, the funds would have proved totally inadequate—viz. indiscriminate religious endowment. Their plan had been assailed as a violation of the rights of property. But the present question was one of policy, not of property. It was not even the fact that the property enjoyed by the Irish Church was the property of a corporation, for it was the property of any number of separate corporations. But, moreover, the right to corporate property was essentially different from the right to private property; and the State, guided by a conscience enlightened by reason, had a perfect right to deal with property given to religious as well as other public uses. He himself, as a public man, felt free, and even bound, to restore the property of this Church to its true uses, and to take it from a flagrantly unjust use; and believed, Protestant though he was of Protestants, that the interests of Protestantism in Ireland would suffer no detriment.

The Bishop of Oxford followed the Duke of Argyll, presenting the argument for the defence of the Church with his usual felicity and skill. He taunted the noble duke with the Presbyterian complexion of his arguments. He asserted that, whatever might be alleged, there was a clear intention to disendow, and the expediency and justice of this he denied. The circumstances of the

Canadian Church were entirely unlike those of the Irish Church. A nation or Church in its youth could dispense with endowments. A nation's youth was the time of endowments; but a Church which had once been endowed formed, as did men, habits from these circumstances, and it was ungenerous and unfair to abandon it, despoiled of its ancient endowment, to an unequal conflict with religious bodies which had not been endowed. He maintained that to confiscate the property of the Irish Church, which was still the Church of St. Patrick, would, besides being most unjust to the 700,000 Protestant souls, be unjust to the Church of Ireland itself, and would be to allot the penalty before allotting the blame—blame which, when the accounts were fairly cast up, would be found to attach first of all to the English Government, which had, as Boulter, Spenser, Swift proved, made the Irish Church the meanest instrument of our misrule. He urged, finally, the rejection of this measure, as what might be, he would repeat, represented as an attempt to buy off assassins; as unfair, since it made the Irish Church the State's whipping-boy; as inexpedient and ungrateful, since it would deprive Ireland of the most intelligent and energetic class of the community; and as a scheme which would, in deference to the sentimental grievance which persons felt at the possession of property by their neighbours, endanger the highest religious and political interests of the country.

Lord Russell was of opinion that great art had been used in avoiding the real question at issue, and in throwing dirt on opponents; and he drew a parallel between the political conduct of certain former members of the houses of Russell and Stanley. Passing lightly by objections to the Bill on points of detail, which might be easily corrected in Committee, and the advantages alleged to accrue to Ireland from the presence of the clergy as a body of resident gentry, he contended that the Irish Church not only failed in promoting religion and morality, which were the only true objects of a Church, but worked great harm by keeping up among the people the feeling of an inequality. This might, indeed, have been assuaged had Mr. Pitt's pledge given at the Union been redeemed. As it was, a cure of this grievance of inequality was imperatively demanded. He himself, at one time had thought, but he thought no longer, that an endowment of the other religious bodies in Ireland would be sufficient. The Conservative party in that House appeared ready to reject the measure of relief which this Bill contained, notwithstanding its approval by a majority of the House of Commons; but he warned them, by reference to the precedents of the Catholic Relief, Corn Law Repeal, and Reform Bills, that if this Bill were rejected, Bills would be sent up from the other House by still increasing majorities for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. He proceeded to defend the conduct of the late Ministry in not having undertaken a measure of this sort together with a Reform Bill, and concluded

by expressing his confident conviction that none of the sequences predicted by the opponents of this Bill would follow.

The Lord Chancellor followed with a speech which maintained, if it did not enhance, his reputation as a master of the arts of luminous statement and of close and subtle argumentation. No better defence of the Established Church of Ireland than this oration, which was subsequently printed and widely circulated, proceeded from any quarter.

The noble and learned lord began by observing that this Bill professed to be a mere corollary, and that the proposition whence it followed, which had not been brought, indeed, before this House, was embodied in the Resolution of the House of Commons that the Church of Ireland should cease to exist as an Established Church, which implied both disendowment and disestablishment. These were the real issues now at stake. But the Bill, the very title of which was a misnomer, was, apart from the consequences which it involved, so full of faults of detail that the only possible way of remedying it in Committee would be by striking out every clause. By it the succession of the Church, uninterrupted for ages, would be broken off, not because something had been determined, but because it might be—with the result that the national Church would be placed in a worse position than any voluntary Church, and that the working in the different dioceses of the island would become entirely unequal. In the course of a very elaborate review of the Bill, for which he denied that the Act of 1833 was any precedent, he showed that the consequences to the families of deceased bishops and incumbents would be calamitous; that one of the most practical results would be, by suspending the patronage of the bishops, to deprive seventy out of every seventy-five curates of all chance of benefices; and that generally the action of the Church, and the process of augmentation of poor livings by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to which the faith of Parliament was pledged, would be paralyzed. Then, passing from the details, he claimed the authority of Lord Palmerston for the conclusion that the Act of Union was against the Bill; and he distinguished the legislative interference with the Church Establishment in Australia and Jamaica from the present attempt. But the Bill was said to be required as an act of justice. Now, there being admittedly no rival claimants, there could be no injustice in the retention by the Irish Church of its property—unless, indeed, the possession of property by any Establishment were an injustice to other religious bodies, which would be a principle as fatal to the English as to the Irish Church Establishment, since the question of numerical proportion would then be immaterial. On the contrary, the injustice would be in disturbing a settlement to which much of the physical prosperity of Ireland was due, and in burdening the Protestant population with the necessity of creating a new fund for the support of religion. He thought no better of the other ground on which this Bill was put—viz. policy. It was the land question

on which popular interest was concentrated, and the present was an English, not an Irish question. The Bill, then, would not conciliate the disaffected, but it would offend and irritate the most thrifty and loyal portion of the nation; it would produce two classes of absentees, the Protestant clergy and gentry; still further, it would cripple and dishearten the Protestant Church in Ireland, driving those outside the large towns into Catholicism, and, however deep now the affection of Englishmen for their Church, perhaps preparing the way for the overthrow even of that; and this legislative interference with corporate property might prove perilous to the rights of private property, which rested, like corporate property, upon law, and the law as to which was equally susceptible of change. He concluded by keenly criticizing the origin and objects of the Bill, and by advising the House, without being moved by the decision come to by the House of Commons, to judge the Bill on its own merits and to reject it as an attack on property, on the supremacy of the Crown, and on the interests of Protestantism and of peace in Ireland.

Earl Granville, in a lively reply to the objections to the Bill, drew attention again to his arguments, which remained unanswered, respecting the disestablishment of the Church in the colonies. He would not follow the Lord Chancellor's minute criticisms on the details of the Bill, but he believed them capable of full defence. He then adverted to the observations of the Bishop of Oxford, who, however, he said, had spoken with so much gaiety of the probable consequences from the Bill that it was impossible to think he believed the fortunes of the Church of England in jeopardy; to expressions, which he deplored, of the Primate of Ireland on the division of races in that country; to attacks, in particular by Lord Salisbury, on his quotation of the opinions of foreigners, and to the arguments of Lord Derby and other Peers on the obligation of the Coronation Oath.

After three nights of highly animated and interesting discussion the House proceeded to a division, which gave the following result:—

For the Second Reading	97
Against it	192
<hr/>	
Majority against the Bill	95

Thus negating by nearly two to one the decision which the House of Commons had pronounced by successive majorities of no inconsiderable amount.

The result, however, was not unexpected, and it created little surprise and no commotion in the public mind. It was never supposed that the Upper House of Parliament—the natural guardian of established institutions and prescriptive rights—would, at the very first assault, surrender the defence of an establishment, which, whatever might be its demerits or defects, rested its proprietary claims on the basis of ancient and recognized possession.

Nor, on the other hand, was it felt by the promoters of the Suspensory Bill that the actual issue involved in it, although not immaterial as affecting the amount of prospective compensations, was of such vital importance as to be made a ground of serious conflict between the two Houses. Acquiescing in the decision for the present, the Opposition party regarded their defeat at this stage of the contest rather in the light of a foregone conclusion, and consoled themselves with the belief that the verdict of the present House of Commons would receive so ample and decisive a confirmation from that which was just about to be elected, as would make the concurrence of the House of Lords, though for the present deferred, an inevitable concession to the clearly declared opinion of the country.

CHAPTER V.

FINANCIAL AFFAIRS—State of the Public Revenue—Mr. Ward Hunt, Chancellor of the Exchequer, makes his financial statement—The public accounts show a deficit for the past year of 1,636,000*l.*—Mr. Hunt proposes to take the Income Tax for the ensuing year at 6*d.*, and anticipates a balance of revenue over expenditure of 722,000*l.* for 1868-9—Mr. Gladstone expresses a general approval of the scheme, but attributes the present deficit to the permanent increase of expenditure—General discussion on the financial statement—The Resolutions proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer are adopted—**PUBLIC EXPENDITURE—THE ESTIMATES**—Mr. Corry, First Lord of the Admiralty, proposes the Navy Estimates, and describes the condition and progress of our Naval Armament and Dockyards—Remarks and Amendment of Mr. Childers, which is supported by Mr. Gladstone, but negatived—Motion of Mr. Seeley for reformation of Admiralty Accounts—Answer of the First Lord of the Admiralty—A Select Committee appointed—Mr. Graves moves a Resolution in favour of diminishing the number of dockyards—Speeches of Mr. Corry and Mr. Childers—Motion withdrawn—*Army Estimates* moved by Sir John Pakington—His statement respecting Military Expenditure, the administration of the War Department, and other topics—Debate on the various questions raised by the Estimate—Votes agreed to—Lord Elcho introduces the subject of military organization, and moves for a Royal Commission to inquire into the question—After some discussion the motion is withdrawn—Resolution moved by Mr. O. Trevelyan for discontinuing the system of Purchase of Commissions—An Amendment modifying the Resolution is moved by Capt. Vivian—Defence of the Purchase-system by Sir John Pakington, General Herbert, Col. Lloyd Lindsay, Lord Elcho, and other members—The motion and amendment are withdrawn—Important alteration in the Mutiny Bill, prohibiting flogging of Soldiers and Marines in time of peace carried against the Government by Mr. Otway—The Amendment is accepted by the House of Lords after speeches from his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, Earl Grey, Viscount Hardinge, and other Peers—*Organization of the Civil Service*—Motion of Mr. Childers for extensive reform of the Civil departments, and statement of his plans—Answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—Motion withdrawn—*The Indian Budget*—Sir Stafford Northcote makes the Annual Financial Statement for India in a very thin House shortly before the Prorogation—Comments on the Statement by Mr. Laing and other Members—The Resolutions are adopted.

THE year 1868 was not signalized by any important financial operations. The state and prospects of the public revenue, now beginning to manifest the effects of a deficient harvest and of con-

tinued commercial depression, were not such as to encourage experiments in finance or readjustments of taxation. Nor was the Chancellor of the Exchequer, new to his office, and a member of a Cabinet representing a minority in the House of Commons, likely to adventure upon any bold step or untried path in the region of fiscal policy. The first budget of Mr. Ward Hunt was, under these circumstances, of a cautious, and unambitious character, the Minister prudently contenting himself with carrying on the financial concerns of the nation for the current year through the medium of the existing machinery, and with the least possible disturbance to the arrangements of trade and the convenience of the tax-payers. On the 23rd of April the right hon. gentleman made his financial statement in a rather thin House, and amidst but slight manifestations of public interest in his disclosures. He said that though the elasticity of the revenue had not equalled that of former years, a retrospect of the financial condition of the country was not unsatisfactory. In April last Mr. Disraeli reckoned on a revenue of 69,130,000*l.*, which in November he increased by supplementary income-tax to 69,970,000*l.*, but the actual income was 69,600,000*l.*, showing a deficit on the estimate of 370,000*l.* The Customs had exceeded the estimate by 650,000*l.*; stamps, by 200,000*l.*; taxes by 9000*l.*; and Crown lands by 5000*l.*, while Excise had fallen short of the estimate by 538,000*l.*; income-tax, 663,000*l.*; Post-office, 20,000*l.*; and miscellaneous, 14,000*l.* Comparing next the revenue of the year with that of 1866-7, the nominal increase was only 165,000*l.*, yet by taking into account on one side the extraordinary receipts of 1866-7 (250,000*l.* China Indemnity, and 500,000*l.* New Zealand Bonds), and on the other, the loss in this year's revenue from the reduction of the marine insurance, and from the arrears of uncollected income-tax, the real increase from the expansion of the revenue this year was 808,000*l.* He stated next, with great minuteness of detail, the branches of revenue and the items which differed in one way or other from the estimate and from last year's yield, showing that in most of the principal items a falling off in Excise was met by a corresponding increase in Customs, and *vice versa*. The whole deficit of 370,000*l.* on the estimates would have been more than made up, he maintained, if the income-tax had all been collected, for though there was a dead loss of 200,000*l.* revenue in this item, the arrears amounted to 463,000*l.* Reviewing rapidly the effect of last year's alterations (mentioning that the actual loss on marine insurances amounted to 270,000*l.*, and that the number of dogs brought under duty had been increased from 445,645 to 828,341), he passed on to the expenditure of the past year, which he placed at 71,236,242*l.* Comparing it, then, in the same way, item by item, with the estimate and the expenditure of the previous year, he showed that, while it fell short of the estimate by 52,000*l.*, it exceeded the expenditure of 1866-7 by 4,455,000*l.*, and disclosed an excess of expenditure over income for the year 1867-8 of

1,636,000*l.* This deficit had been met out of the balances in the Exchequer, and, as a consequence, with the other excesses of payments over receipts, the balances which, at the end of March, 1867, stood at 7,294,000*l.*, at the same date in 1868 were only 4,782,000*l.* This, though a larger reduction than was wise, had not been productive of any practical inconvenience. Mr. Hunt passed then to the finances of the coming year, and dealing first with the ordinary expenditure, and putting out of sight for the present the Abyssinian expedition, he estimated it thus:—

Interest on Debt	£26,700,000
Other Consolidated Fund charges	1,865,000
Army	15,456,000
Navy	11,177,000
Civil Services	9,173,000
Revenue Departments	4,968,000
Post-office and Packet Service	1,889,000

Total £70,428,000

Having explained the changes in the charges for the debt, the result of which was an increase of 80,000*l.*, and offered some reasons for the increase in the Estimates—which he showed in certain cases to be more apparent than real—he stated his proposals for raising the revenue of the year. Assuming the tea duty to be continued, and taking the Income-tax at 4*d.*, he thus calculated the next year's income:—

Customs	£22,800,000
Excise	20,330,000
Income-tax at 4 <i>d.</i> , and including arrears	6,900,000
Stamps	9,650,000
Taxes	3,540,000
Post-office	4,650,000
Crown Lands	350,000
Miscellaneous	3,330,000

Total revenue	£71,350,000
Total expenditure	70,428,000

Estimated surplus £922,000

Mr. Hunt then explained how he proposed to provide for the extraordinary expenditure on the Abyssinian war. Premising that Mr. Disraeli's original estimate of 2,000,000*l.* for placing the army on the coast of Africa would not be exceeded, and would represent the cost of the expedition up to the beginning of the year, its expenses from that date he calculated at 600,000*l.* per month, made up thus:—Sea transport, 400,000*l.*; provision for troops, 28,000*l.*; provisions for baggage animals, 90,000*l.*; extra allowance to troops, 10,000*l.*; coals, 26,000*l.*; miscellaneous, 35,000*l.* And as it was confidently expected that the expedition would be

over by the end of May, its total cost would be 5,000,000*l.*, of which 3,000,000*l.* remained to be provided. If this had been a permanent expenditure, Mr. Hunt said he should propose to raise some part of the sum by a tax upon articles of consumption; but considering how soon it would be over, and the double disturbance to trade caused by putting on an indirect tax for a short time, and taking it off again, he preferred to resort to an additional income-tax of 2*d.*, thus raising the rate from 4*d.* to 6*d.* in the pound. This would produce 2,900,000*l.*, of which, however, only 1,800,000*l.* would come in this year, and therefore, in order to avoid Mr. Gladstone's objectionable device of raising the additional tax on the first half-year, he proposed to take power to issue 1,000,000*l.* Exchequer bonds for a year, to be repaid when the second half-year of the tax came in. The result would be that, taking into account the surplus on the ordinary revenue and expenditure, viz. 922,000*l.*, there would be 3,722,000*l.* to meet the expense of the Abyssinian war; and calculating this at 3,000,000*l.* for this year (and there was no reason to believe it would be exceeded), there would remain a surplus of 722,000*l.* over and above the ordinary and extraordinary expenditure of the year. He also proposed to take power to renew 600,000*l.* Exchequer bonds, which would fall due on March 18, 1869.

Mr. Gladstone signified a general assent to the scheme, admitting that it was wise not to disturb trade by increasing indirect taxation, and that the burden was fairly divided between the present and the future. Remarking that Mr. Hunt had not been very liberal in his provision for the Expedition, he insisted that the addition of 2*d.* to the Income-tax had been caused, not by the Abyssinian war, but by the permanent addition to the expenditure of the country which had occurred under the present Government. To enforce this contention he entered into an elaborate comparison of the estimates of the last three years, concluding that they had increased by 2,840,000*l.* since the Government came into office.

Mr. T. Baring strongly deprecated placing the whole cost of the war on income, and maintained that an addition of five per cent. to the Customs duties would not have created so much disturbance of trade as had been anticipated.

Mr. Hubbard differed from Mr. Baring, and preferred direct taxation, but pointed out that but for Mr. Gladstone's scheme for reducing the public debt, there would have been a million applicable to the war. To Mr. Gladstone's remarks on the increase of permanent expenditure, he replied that it was made necessary by the low ebb at which the late Government had left the military services, and that if we had been spending three millions a year less, our revenue would also have been less, and additional taxation would have been needed at this moment just the same.

Several members who took part in the discussion descanted strongly on the high amount of the Estimates and the want of economy displayed by the present Government. Others urged

the propriety of giving up or suspending the operation of Mr. Gladstone's scheme for redeeming the public debt. The Chancellor of the Exchequer replied to Mr. Gladstone's criticisms, arguing that, not having opposed the Estimates of the Government for the preceding year, he was as much responsible for them as the Government were; and also alleging that the late Ministers had left the army and navy in so inefficient a state through their mistaken parsimony as to impose on their successors the necessity of increased expenditure.

The Resolutions were then agreed to.

The two great heads of Public Expenditure, those for the Army and Navy services, were this year estimated at very high amounts, each of them exhibiting an increase over the preceding year. This augmentation of the public burdens occasioned a good deal of comment and gave rise to imputations of extravagance against the Ministry, which were frequently repeated at the ensuing General Election. The charge was, however, retorted upon their opponents by the party in power, who alleged, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had done in the speech just extracted, that it was the misplaced economy of the Liberal Cabinets that had left our national armaments in a defective state, and entailed the necessity for additional outlay upon their successors. These charges of profusion and parsimony were as usual, freely bandied about between the two parties, and probably not without some exaggeration on both sides. The general subjects of naval and military organization and expenditure were discussed at some length upon the occasion of moving the Estimates in the House of Commons. Those for the navy were explained by Mr. Corry, the First Lord of the Admiralty, on the 11th of May. Previously to the House going into Committee on that day, some serious animadversions upon our marine equipments were made by Captain Mackinnon, who called attention to numerous defects both in the sailing and fighting qualities of the recent additions to our iron-clad navy. He instituted an elaborate comparison between them and well-known vessels of the wooden navy, contending that the iron fleet was faulty, inferior, and retrograde.

Mr. Samuda commented with some severity on the treatment of the designs sent in to the Admiralty by private shipbuilders in recent competitions, and complained particularly of the partiality shown to the broadside over the turret system.

After a brief vindication of the Admiralty against these complaints, Mr. Corry proceeded to state the amount and purposes of the Estimates for the current year. Their amount he set down at 11,177,290*l.*, as against 10,976,253*l.* for 1867, giving an apparent increase of 201,937*l.*, but, taking into account transfers of various items to and from other departments, the real increase, he showed, over last year was only 9840*l.*; and the naval policy of the year, he added, would be to concentrate on the increase of our armour-clad fleet as much force as was compatible with maintaining the

efficiency of other Departments. Passing to details, he dwelt for some time on the first vote—the number of men, and, pointing out that its amount must depend mainly on the strength of our foreign squadrons, he discussed at considerable length the suggestions made last year by Mr. Childers, on this particular. Among other causes for maintaining these squadrons he pointed out that if we withdrew them or over-reduced them, in the event of a war we should lose the command of the sea on distant stations, and our commerce would be destroyed; that the foreign squadrons were the schools of our sailors, and that in most cases their strength was governed by considerations of policy, the Foreign-office being in reality more responsible than the Admiralty. He mentioned, too, that while the cost of the French navy was 6·35 per cent. of the value of the trade of France, the cost of the British navy was only 2·73 of the value of our trade. But after making careful inquiries from the commanding officers who had recently returned home from foreign stations, the Admiralty had made some reduction in those squadrons, which he explained in detail, amounting in all to fifteen ships and 2758 men. Looking, therefore, to all considerations—to the state of Europe and to the importance of not breaking faith with the continuous service men, who numbered 16,754 out of the 18,963 blue-jackets in the fleet—the Admiralty had not been able to propose a greater reduction in the number of seamen (which includes all ratings) than to 35,700 as against 37,015, the number of last year, but taking into account an increase of 450 in the Coastguard, and a decrease of 1700 Marines, there was a total decrease of 2542 men. But notwithstanding this reduction there was an increase in the two Votes for wages and victuals, owing to various causes, such as increase of allowances, rise in prices, transfers of accounts, and the like—in the first case of 85,682*l.*, and in the second of 94,258*l.* Proceeding to the two great votes—No. 6 (Dockyards) and No. 10 (Naval Stores)—Mr. Corry stated while on the first there was a decrease of 151,861*l.*, on the second there was an increase of 269,332*l.*, of which 231,941*l.* was for the purchase of contract-built vessels, showing as a balance of the two votes an increase of 117,527*l.* After explaining in great detail the shipbuilding programme of last year—which he showed had been pretty closely carried out, particularly in the dockyards, both as to the number of tons ordered and the expenditure sanctioned, Mr. Corry next stated the programme for the coming year. Besides the work already begun, but not completed—amounting to 1,116,894 tons—it included eight new ships, viz. two unarmoured corvettes (to cost this year 42,206*l.*) and six armour-clad vessels—three to be built in the dockyards and three in private yards. In the dockyards were to be built the Sultan, a first-class iron-clad, the Iron Duke, a second-class, and the Triumph, of the Audacious class; and in private yards, a sister ship to the Triumph, a single turreted Monitor of 2700 tons, and a ram of 2137 tons. Of all these Mr. Corry gave full

particulars, and the general result of the programme of the year was that 7478 tons of armoured ships would be built in the year, and 6931 unarmoured—in all, 14,409 tons, and that in round numbers 2,000,000*l.* would be spent in the dockyards and on private contract work. By these means at the end of the autumn we should have a reserve squadron of seven iron-clads, most of which would be employed as guard-ships at different ports. Having gone through an elaborate comparison of the expenditure in former years on the building of iron-clads, and holding out hopes of being able to effect sensible reductions in the dockyards, Mr. Corry concluded with some general remarks on the condition of the navy of a very satisfactory character. The proportion of good-service badges had risen, desertions had decreased, the number of seamen, gunners, and trained men had increased, the men made a much more general use of the naval savings-banks, and the sanitary condition of the navy was excellent.

Mr. Childers complimented the Admiralty on their success in carrying on reforms commenced by their predecessors, and on their readiness to profit by the suggestions of their political opponents. Still, the Estimates, he contended, showed many signs of a disregard for economy; and to illustrate this he went through them minutely, criticizing some of the items with much strictness. Particularly he commented on the fact that, though there was a reduction of nearly 5000 men, the cost of the Admiralty establishments had increased by 13,000*l.*; and on the unnecessarily large staff of skilled artificers. He concluded by moving a reduction of 60,000*l.* in the wages of Marines, pointing out that though the number of Marines was reduced, the number of officers was raised.

In the discussion which followed, the amendment was supported by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. M. Chambers. It was opposed by Lord Henry Lennox, Secretary to the Admiralty, who replied to the various objections made by Mr. Childers, and by General Herbert, Sir John Hay, and Mr. Graves. The amendment was negatived on a division by 127 to 73.

Colonel Sykes then moved a general reduction of the whole wages vote by 20,000*l.*, explaining that his particular object was to reduce the expenditure on the Slave Trade Squadron, which he maintained was useless and unnecessary.

Sir J. Hay showed Colonel Sykes that he had been misled as to the strength of the squadron, which had been reduced very recently, and was acknowledged to be most effectual in checking the slave trade.

After some observations from Mr. Buxton, Sir G. Bowyer, and other members, Colonel Sykes withdrew his motion, and the votes proposed were agreed to.

Two questions relating to Admiralty administration were moved in the House of Commons early in this Session, which gave rise to some debate. The first was a motion by Mr. Seely for a select committee to inquire and report as to the application of moneys

voted by Parliament for the use of the Admiralty ; and, secondly, as to the method in which the accounts should be prepared for presentation to the House. Mr. Seely produced a mass of figures in reference to the cost of building and repairing ships, with a view of showing that the accounts were misleading, and that the actual cost both of building and repairing ships was much more than was represented if the indirect charges were all included. The Commissioners of 1861 had reported that the accounts of the Admiralty were elaborate and minute, but not to be relied on for any practical purpose.

Mr. Corry said the details given by Mr. Seely were much exaggerated. As to the allegation that the "Frederick William" had cost 282,000*l.*, and might have been built in a private yard for 134,000*l.*; he stated that the "Frederick William" had been first laid down for a two-decker and then converted into a three-decker, and from a sailing ship into a screw steamer. He also contended, by reference to the cost of repairs of ships built in yards as compared with those built in her Majesty's dockyards, that the latter were the cheapest in the end. As regarded the accounts, the Admiralty had appointed a committee of three heads of departments to devise a mode of making out the accounts which would be more simple and easily understood, and he intended to submit their report to Parliament. He, however, should not object to the select committee if its inquiries were limited to dockyard expenditure.

Mr. Childers admitted that of late years there had been a progressive improvement in the mode of keeping the accounts, but he argued that there was room for further improvement. The motion was carried and a select committee named.

The other motion was made by Mr. Graves, one of the members for Liverpool; it related to the subject of dockyards. Having called attention to the report of a select committee respecting this matter, Mr. Graves moved, "that in the opinion of this House the number of dockyards ought to be diminished." He pointed particularly to Deptford, Woolwich, Sheerness, and Pembroke as being unnecessary, and supported his contention by numerous statistics. He argued that they cost far more than the value of the work they turned out. The cost of managing these four yards was not less than 124,000*l.* annually, they required a large amount of dockyard craft, and absorbed much surplus and unproductive stock and stores. On an average the work done cost about 40*l.* per ton, while it could be done in private yards at 25*l.* On the whole he calculated that by closing these four yards 250,000*l.* a year might be saved without injuring the efficiency of the navy, for Chatham, Devonport, Portsmouth, Portland, and Cork would amply suffice for all our exigencies. As to the mode of disposing of them, estimating their value at 3,000,000*l.*, he would sell them if a good price could be got, and if not, he would close them, and thus save the expenses

1868.]

of their staff, though Deptford, he allowed, might be turned to use as a victualling-yard.

Mr. Corry agreed that it would be advisable to abolish the river yards when the extensions at Chatham were completed. *Pembroke*, however, was most useful for building purposes, and Sheerness in the event of a war in the North Sea would be an invaluable station. Deptford might be advantageously used for victualling purposes, and Woolwich might be got rid of altogether. The expediency of dispensing with Deptford had already been mooted, but it had been reported that it was advisable first to use up the considerable stock of timber there. Mr. Corry pointed out some errors into which Mr. Graves had fallen about the cost of the dockyards, and defended generally their efficiency and utility.

Mr. Childers concurred with Mr. Corry that *Pembroke* ought to be retained for a building yard, and that Deptford might be retained for victualling and military purposes, but Woolwich ought to be abolished immediately. That was the opinion of the late board, and they had begun to take steps for the purpose, but the present board, he complained, had reversed their policy. Sheerness he held to be totally useless for building purposes, and if retained at all it should be solely for refitting the *Nore* squadron.

After some remarks from Mr. Scourfield, who defended the usefulness of *Pembroke Dockyard*, the motion was withdrawn.

The *Army Estimates* were moved by Sir John Pakington, Secretary of State for War, on the 23rd of March. The right honourable gentleman began his statement by correcting at the outset the prevalent misapprehension that the army was this year to cost 15,425,000*l.*, showing that, by repayments and charges for other services which ought not fairly to be included in the *Army Estimates*, its cost was reduced to considerably under 14,000,000*l.*, practically no increase on last year's estimate. His sincere desire was to reduce the expense of the army within the narrowest possible limits, and he explained that whatever increase there was arose chiefly under the items of additions to the Volunteer Capitation Grant, in the numbers of the Militia, and in the Survey expenditure. In the number of men there was a slight decrease—from 137,245 to 136,650 and there were slight increases in the clothing and barrack votes. On the Hospital vote there was also an apparent increase of about 105,000*l.*, caused by the transfer of the medical officers from one vote to another. Sir John Pakington next explained his reasons for not agreeing entirely in the report of the Committee on Retirement in the Artillery and Engineers, and he congratulated General Peel on the unqualified success of the change he had made in the recruiting system, which was shown by the large number of re-engagements, the unusually small discrepancy between the actual establishment and the numbers voted, and the improvement in the class of recruits. He stated, too, his intention of carrying out some of the recommendations of the

but maintained that there was ample information available for immediate action without another inquiry. It was a question, too, which ought to be decided by the Minister on his own responsibility, and not by a Royal Commission. He criticized minutely Sir J. Pakington's Army Reserve scheme, and preferred to it his own original proposals, particularly for the greater prominence which they gave to the Militia. The pressing problem was to find officers for the Militia, and he urged Sir J. Pakington specially to direct his efforts to this point.

General Dunne urged the importance of encouraging the Militia force. Col. Wilson Patten expressed the readiness of the Militia officers to forward the scheme of a reserve army. Sir H. Verney was in favour of establishing short terms of service for the regular army. Mr. Hayter agreed with General Peel as to the unfitness of a Royal Commission for dealing with the question. He suggested a change in our colonial military policy which would release many regiments of the army for other service.

Major Jervis made some rather severe reflections on the irregularities which had taken place at a recent review of volunteers at Windsor.

Sir J. Pakington drew from the general tone of Lord Elcho's speech that he was favourable to some kind of compulsory system, and this Sir John said he could never be a party to. Certainly no moment could be more inopportune than this, when the voluntary system was working with extraordinary success. The total number of our Reserve Forces Sir John put at 311,000, and in giving the details of this estimate he remarked parenthetically with regard to the volunteers, that the events of the recent review at Windsor showed their discipline was not yet perfect, and that if they were to be brought together in large bodies some change of arrangement would be necessary. Theoretically, however, he pointed out, the Queen had the power of putting the Militia ballot into operation at any moment. Admitting that something must be done to increase the supply of officers for the Militia, he showed next that the Army Reserve experiment was succeeding beyond expectation, and under the circumstances a Royal Commission was unnecessary.

Lord Elcho, in his reply, adverted to the severe comments of Major Jervis on the conduct of the volunteers at Windsor, and warmly defending that body, threw the blame partly on the defective arrangements of the War Office and partly on the railway companies. Eventually the motion was withdrawn.

The subject of purchase in the army, which had of late years been a frequent topic of inquiry and discussion, was again brought before the House of Commons on a formal motion by Mr. O. Trevelyan on the 19th of May. The honourable gentleman moved a series of resolutions, the first declaring that the purchase and sale of military commissions should be discontinued after a date to be fixed for that purpose; and the others laying down regulations then to be observed with regard to the retirement of officers and

promotion. He said the army could not be a profession in the proper sense of the term, so long as the purchase system continued. It could not be said to be a profession unless a man could live by it, and be able to rise according to his professional merits, but neither of these conditions existed. It was quite impossible to ameliorate the condition of our army so long as the purchase system existed. But if they were to abolish it they must make up their minds to pay the officers not only the regulation prices for their commissions, but the fancy prices which they had paid. The honourable member dwelt at some length on the evils of the present system, and contended that it was necessary that something should be done to get the middle class into the army, and make it a democratic army in the true sense of the word.

Mr. Melly seconded the motion. It was opposed by Captain Vivian, who moved an amendment embracing the following objects, viz. 1, The abolition of purchase above the rank of captain in the Cavalry and the Infantry of the Line; 2, The reduction of the number of regimental commissioned ranks to three—viz. lieutenant-colonel, captain, and lieutenant; 3, The institution of a course of practical professional training as a necessary preliminary to the acquisition of a commission in the Cavalry, Guards, or Line. He objected to the motion, among other reasons, on account of its cost. To buy up the vested interests of the officers the country would have to pay 20,000,000*l.* spread over a period of about twenty years; it would be necessary also to revise the whole system of retirement, causing an addition in perpetuity of 1,000,000*l.* a year to the Army Estimates. Captain Vivian advocated a considerable reduction in the number of regimental officers.

General Peel also opposed the motion. He said there was practically a purchase system in the Church and at the bar; for though the highest offices in the law could not be purchased directly, the passage to them was through that House, and that cost money. Before they resolved on the abolition of the purchase system they must have a fuller explanation of what it would cost. It was far too large a question to be settled by a mere resolution of that House, and he objected to it not only on account of the expense, but on account of the alteration it would make in the composition of the army. It would alter altogether the system of officering the army. If promotions were by selection great jealousy would be caused, and the House would be inundated with complaints. One benefit of the purchase system was that it accelerated promotion.

Mr. Grenfell, General Herbert, and Colonel Loyd Lindsay urged arguments in vindication of the purchase system.

Mr. Otway said it was by selection that promotion was conducted in other armies. There was no purchase in the Royal Engineers, the Artillery, and the Royal Marines, and he appealed to the House whether there were better officers in the service? The Abyssinian expedition was conducted by an Engineer officer, who

owed to purchase no step in his promotion. He granted that the purchase system might be retained with advantage for the Cavalry, but he saw no reason why it should be retained for the Infantry.

Lord Elcho defended the system of purchase. He was in favour of giving appointments in the Commissariat service, and clerkships in the War Office to retired soldiers. He objected to the motion, among other reasons, on the ground of expense.

Sir J. Pakington admitted that the system of purchase was full of serious anomalies, and would not now be resorted to if we were seeking to establish a system of promotion for the first time. At the same time, he pointed out serious fallacies in the objections urged against it. For instance, all the talk about the advantage which it gave to the rich over the poor, for the non-purchasing officer benefited by it more than any by the quick promotion which it caused. So, too, it was a delusion to suppose that another effect was to officer the army entirely from the aristocracy, as any one might see by a glance at the *Army List* or the *Gazette*. To the promotion of non-commissioned officers from the ranks in a definite proportion he was strongly opposed. The present system of promotion from the ranks could not be improved on; but in most cases this promotion was an unwelcome boon, and Lord Elcho's suggestion as to the employment of retired soldiers as clerks had been carried out to a considerable extent in the War Office. Touching on the difficulties of retirement Sir John maintained that the example of the French army which had been referred to was one to be avoided, and he mentioned that, though not prepared to take up Mr. Childers' costly plan of retirement for the non-purchase corps, he hoped before the close of the Session to produce a plan which would be satisfactory to all parties. Admitting that Captain Vivian's scheme had been sanctioned by high authority—though it would cost between a million and a half and two millions—he could not support it at the present moment.

After a reply from Mr. Trevelyan, the motion and amendment were both withdrawn.

A change of an important character in regard to the discipline of the army was this year introduced into the Mutiny Bill. Mr. Otway who had for several years persevered in the attempt to procure a decision of the House of Commons against flogging in the army, renewed his motion in the Committee on this Bill, proposing to insert words providing that no court-martial should have power to sentence any soldier to corporal punishment in time of peace.

Sir John Pakington in opposing the motion observed that a great concession was made in the last Session, when the power of inflicting corporal punishment was reduced to a large extent. Another reason against the motion was that a Royal Commission was then inquiring into the whole system of military punishments.

Sir Charles Russell spoke in opposition to the motion, observing that they were now getting a better class of men into the army, but

that it was necessary to retain the corporal punishment in order to enforce discipline over the ruffians who belonged to it.

On a division Mr. Otway's amendment was carried against the Government by 152 to 127. The same honourable member also induced the House, with the consent of Sir John Pakington, to strike out the customary words in the preamble of the Bill, "and for the preservation of the balance of power in Europe."

The Marine Mutiny Bill was also amended in conformity with the motion carried by Mr. Otway on the Army Bill, by the insertion of a proviso that Marines on shore should not be liable to corporal punishment in time of peace.

When the Mutiny Bill came up to the House of Lords His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief addressed to the House some remarks in reference to this amendment. His Royal Highness said, while by no means wishing to disturb the decision the House of Commons had come to with reference to corporal punishment, still he could not help saying that the military authorities were now placed in a most awkward position; for they could not inflict corporal punishment, and no other means of correction had been substituted. In the civil law corporal punishment had lately been introduced in the case of the garotters with the best effect, and he thought that the deterrent effect which corporal punishment had in checking outrageous offences in the army was most salutary in its operation. He did hope, as corporal punishment was now abolished, the Royal Commission now sitting would give the authorities something in lieu of it to support the discipline of the army.

Some Peers, among whom were Earl Grey, the Marquis of Exeter, and Viscount Hardinge, expressed their regret that the House of Commons had adopted the decision against corporal punishment without waiting for the report of the Royal Commission on military punishments then sitting. The Bill was then passed as amended.

The Estimates for the third great branch of Domestic Expenditure, the Civil Service, underwent the usual ordeal of discussion in the House of Commons, when several of the votes proposed were excepted to, and many were put to the test of a division, but with the ordinary result of the House declining to over-rule the discretion of the Government in regard to the sums demanded on their responsibility for the public departments. The whole question of the organization of the Civil Service, however, its extent, cost, and classification, was entered upon and led to an interesting discussion, the subject being brought forward in a comprehensive speech by Mr. Childers, the Secretary to the Treasury under the late Government. From the statistics quoted by him it appeared that there is paid in salaries to the strictly Civil Services 10,839,000*l.* (exclusive of 1,601,000*l.* for super-annuations), and this he showed to be 2,000,000*l.* more than the salaries of the Army and Navy Departments, and considerably

higher than the corresponding expenditure in the French and American Budgets. After illustrating the rapid increase in the cost of our Civil Service by a comparison of the present strength of the principal departments with that in the year 1853, and premising that he looked for reduction, not in diminution of salaries, but in reduction of staff, Mr. Childers indicated what he held to be the chief defects in our present system. First of all came the entire want of classification of salaries; next, the absence of distinction between those who worked with their hands and with their brains; next, the want of systematic control over the expenditure of the departments; and lastly, the unsound system of superannuation. Under the second head he hinted a doubt whether the system of competitive examination had not been carried so far that in the lower grades we occasionally got men who were too good for their work, which ended in a demand for, and an ultimate concession of, higher salaries. Mr. Childers then proceeded to state the remedial measures which he would propose. First, he would give all public servants to understand that if they could reduce their numbers, the reduction should be taken into account in dealing with their salaries. He believed that if this were done, in many instances two public servants would be able to do work which now required three. Next, a clear distinction should be drawn between clerks and writers, between brainwork and handwork. In the clerical part of the service we should extend the system adopted in the Admiralty and Customs of employing an inferior class of men as writers, and paying them by the day, without any right to superannuation, and with power to discharge them if their services were not satisfactory. We might certainly carry out this plan much further than we did in the military and naval departments, and he should like to see soldiers employed upon work to be paid at the rate of three or four times as much as a soldier's pay. The third remedy he proposed was simplification of class. It was possible by degrees to lay down a rule as to classification, which, of course, would not apply to all departments equally, but still one which would prevent enormous additions to our expenditure. Fourthly, for the future, when persons as to whom we did not require the present system of superannuation entered the service, he would give them no right to superannuation, but would treat them as we treat a large number of persons in the dockyards, who remained in the service just as much as they would if they were entitled to superannuation, and in this way we should in process of time save between three quarters of a million and a million. The last remedy he would suggest was that the House should increase the control of the Treasury, by discharging more effectually its own economical functions and enabling the Treasury to effect financial reforms. In making these suggestions he meant to convey no reflection upon right honourable gentlemen opposite. It was not a party but an economical question which was involved; it was

simply how the House could best discharge one of its most important functions; and if he had done no more for the present than direct the attention of some honourable members to the subject his object would have been gained.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, while agreeing in many respects with Mr. Childers' speech, pointed in extenuation of the increased cost of the Civil Service to the many new duties which had been imposed on it. It was necessary to take into account the march of luxury and refinement, which led both to increase of salaries, and increase in the numbers of persons employed. Another cause was the lukewarm support the Treasury got from the House in its endeavours to control the other departments, and he concurred entirely with Mr. Childers that competitive examination in the lower grades occasionally brought in men who were above their work. As to the system of classification, Mr. Hunt feared that with due regard to vested interests it could not be carried out for a generation. By that time some new idea might have sprung up, and perhaps, on the whole, it would be best to let well alone, rather than to embark on any new scheme. The motion was withdrawn.

The last financial work of the Session in which Parliament was concerned, was the statement of the Secretary of State for India on the finances of that part of the empire. As usual, this exposition was deferred till the last week of the Session, and it excited this year, if possible, even less interest, and was listened to by a smaller knot of members than is usual on the same occasion. About thirty members of the House of Commons constituted the audience before which, on the 27th July, Sir Stafford Northcote exhibited his account of the financial and commercial condition of that vast province of the British Crown, whose affairs are now administered under the direct control of the Imperial Legislature. The right honourable baronet commenced with a statement of the actual figures of the year 1866-67, the expenditure for which was 44,530,000*l.*, against a revenue of 42,012,000*l.*, showing a difference of 2,517,000*l.*, and this he contrasted with the estimates of that year, which only contemplated a difference of 2,352,000*l.* He next contrasted the Budget estimate for 1867-68 with the actual estimate, made up from eight months' actual experience and four months' averages. In the first the revenue was put at 46,783,000*l.*, and the expenditure, including extraordinary public works, at 48,610,000*l.*, showing a deficit of 1,827,000*l.* But the actual figures were—revenue, 48,258,800*l.*; charges, 49,364,000*l.*; thus reducing the actual deficit to 1,106,000*l.* Passing to the items, Sir S. Northcote mentioned that the licence-tax had increased by 158,000*l.*, the Customs by 188,000*l.*, and the opium revenue by 1,100,000*l.*, and on the other items there were decreases and increases which pretty nearly balanced each other. In the expenditure there had been an excess on almost every item except public works; the general charges (including the army) had risen by 265,000*l.*, the charges in England by 580,000*l.*, and

the railway interest 660,000*l.*—in all, an excess of about a million and a half. On the other hand, about three-quarters of a million less had been spent on public works than was estimated; and though he admitted it to be unsatisfactory that the only saving should be on this item, he pointed out that, in every other Budget but the Indian, the cost of extraordinary public works would be placed to capital and not to revenue, and if this were done the deficit would be converted into a surplus. The same remark applied to the estimate for the year 1868-69—in which the revenue was put at 48,586,000*l.*, and the charges at 49,613,000*l.*, giving a deficit of 1,026,000*l.* But if the charge for extraordinary public works, 3,092,000*l.*, were transferred to capital, there would be a considerable surplus. There had been a very nice discussion on this point in India, and he had recently laid down a rule that only irrigation and special fund works should be considered extraordinary public works, and that all but remunerative works should be provided out of revenue. Examining the details, Sir S. Northcote said there was practically little or no change in next year's estimates, and, under all the circumstances, he approved Mr. Massey's decision not to make any changes in the taxation. Looking, however, to the precarious nature of the opium revenue, which now stood at the unprecedentedly high figure of 8,000,000*l.*, he had directed that in future estimates it should be taken at a fixed average, and that endeavours should be made to show in the accounts the returns which were actually obtained from the reproductive works. After showing in detail, under the three heads of land revenue, consumers' taxes, and mercantile taxes, how largely the Indian revenue had grown since 1856, the right honourable baronet concluded by explaining changes recently made in the home accounts, which he proposed for the future should be referred to the Public Accounts Committee. He concluded by moving the formal resolutions, declaring the revenue and expenditure of India for the year ending March 31st, 1868.

A discussion of rather a desultory nature took place. Mr. Laing argued that the statement which had just been made showed him to have been in the right in his controversy with Lord Halifax, the gist of which was that in 1862 the Indian revenue had regained its equilibrium after the Mutiny. From this Mr. Laing diverged into some general remarks on Indian finance, with the view of correcting the rather gloomy view taken of the subject in this country. The opium revenue, he contended, was no more precarious than the revenue from spirits here, and he went at length into the figures to show that the whole revenue was elastic, that the material progress of India was eminently satisfactory, and that the population had received unmixed benefit from our rule. The general result which he drew was that public works ought not to be starved from a reluctance to borrow money, and he recommended a Public Works Loan of 20,000,000*l.*, spread over six years, on conditions which he explained. Particularly with a view to political

emergencies, he pressed for the completion of lines to Peshawur and along the valley of the Indus.

Colonel Sykes, Mr. Bayley, and Mr. A. Kinnaird dwelt on the importance of irrigation works and economical administration, and Mr. Grant Duff offered some observations on the financial situation.

CHAPTER VI.

FOREIGN AND COLONIAL POLICY AND AFFAIRS—Differences with the United States of America on the "Alabama" Claims—Sketch of the proceedings in this controversy—Debates in Parliament on the subject—Motion by Mr. G. Shaw-Lefevre—Discreet and conciliatory Speech of Lord Stanley—Salutary effects of this discussion—Speech of Earl Russell on the same question in the House of Lords—Opinions expressed by Lord Westbury and the Lord Chancellor—Motion of Mr. W. E. Forster on the subject of the indefeasible allegiance of British subjects—Observations of Lord Stanley and Sir R. Palmer—*The Cretan Insurrection*—The attitude of our Government in respect to the relations of Greece and the Porte is commented upon in the House of Lords—Earl Russell, in answer to Lord Stratheden, expresses strong approval of the policy of the British Government—Lord Stanley likewise vindicates his own proceedings in the House of Commons—*British Rule in India*—Lord William Hay makes an interesting speech in the House of Commons in reference to recent official communications to the Government of India—Discussion on the effect of our administration on the native population—Remarks of Sir Stafford Northcote—*The British American Colonies Confederation Act of 1867*—Objections and remonstrances of the people of Nova Scotia against the Union—Agitation against the Act in that province, and Addresses to the Queen—Mr. Bright moves for a Commission of Inquiry—The motion is opposed by Mr. Adderley and Mr. Cardwell, and is rejected by a large majority—The same question is raised by Lord Stratheden in the House of Lords—The Confederation Act is vindicated by the Duke of Buckingham and the Earl of Carnarvon—*The Abyssinian Expedition*—Glorious and satisfactory results of the campaign in the capture of Magdala and death of King Theodore—Great public rejoicing at these events—The Thanks of both Houses of Parliament to the General commanding, his officers and men, are voted *nem. con.*—Speeches of the leaders of parties in the two Houses on these events—Sir Robert Napier is created a Peer, and an annuity of 2000*l.* a year for two lives is voted to him on a recommendation from the Crown—*Attempted Assassination of the Duke of Edinburgh at Sydney*—Great public indignation and anxiety excited by this occurrence—Addresses of sympathy to the Crown are moved and carried by the Lords and Commons—O'Farrel, the assailant of the Prince, is tried and executed at Sydney—Warm manifestations of loyalty in that settlement—Favourable progress of his Royal Highness towards recovery—His Address at a banquet before leaving the colony—The Prince returns to England, and is reported convalescent.

ONE of the most delicate and anxious questions pending this year between Great Britain and a foreign power was that which arose out of the civil war in the United States in respect of the claims for compensation for losses inflicted upon the commercial marine of the Northern States by the Confederate cruiser "Alabama." The circumstances which gave rise to this controversy may be briefly recapitulated.

In July, 1862, a vessel evidently intended for war purposes, and, if not completely ready for warlike operations, capable of being quickly converted into a cruiser of the highest efficiency, left

Liverpool. The Government of the United States alleged that the English Government received ample warning of the character and design of this vessel; that it was a matter of international obligation to detain her; and that her departure was due to neglect of an international duty on the part either of the Executive Government or of their subordinate officers. The vessel sailed, and having met at the Azores another vessel carrying men and munitions, was armed and equipped as a ship of war, and thereupon hoisted the Southern ensign and became the "Alabama." The American Government claimed to be repaid the damages inflicted by her on American commerce. When the claim was first made, Lord Russell, the then Foreign Secretary, refused to entertain it, and when a proposal was submitted to refer the claim to arbitration Lord Russell declined to accede to it. Lord Stanley came into office in 1866, and at the close of the year offered, through Sir Frederick Bruce, to adopt the principle of arbitration, which Mr. Seward accepted on condition that the whole controversy between the two Governments should be referred. The meaning of this condition is not very clear, but it was probably intended to include a complaint, made by Mr. Seward in August, 1866, that the recognition of the Confederacy by the British Government as a belligerent had been premature and injurious. Lord Stanley inferred that this was Mr. Seward's meaning, and replied that her Majesty's Government could not consent to an unlimited reference involving a point they had from the first refused to submit to arbitration. Mr. Seward's reply was, unfortunately, again not free from ambiguity, but he declared that the United States' Government would deem itself at liberty to insist before the arbiter that the actual proceedings of the British Government . . . in relation to the rebellion . . . are among the matters which are connected with the vessels whose depredations are complained of," and as Lord Stanley again refused to refer to arbitration the policy of recognition, the negotiations broke off.

The controversy was at this stage when the subject was brought before the House of Commons on the 6th of March by Mr. G. Shaw-Lefevre, and underwent a full and, we may truly add, a dispassionate discussion in that assembly. The manner in which the debate was introduced and conducted was worthy of the subject. A spirit of cautious moderation and courtesy actuated the speakers on both sides, and the language used by the Foreign Secretary in particular was remarkable for its conciliatory and temperate tone. The maintenance of friendly relations between the two nations was acknowledged on all sides to be an object of paramount importance, compared to which any sacrifice not involving the national honour was of secondary account. Impressed with this feeling; even those members who differed in their impressions of law or fact, were actuated by a manifest unity of sentiment and aim.

Mr. Shaw-Lefevre in calling the attention of the House to the

failure of the negotiations, disclaimed all desire to complicate future negotiations with the United States. He narrated at some length the history of the "Alabama" and the other Southern cruisers, which between them had destroyed more than 200 American vessels, and dwelt on the bitter feelings which had been caused on the other side of the Atlantic by these operations, although he owned that a large portion of the loss had fallen on English insurers. Though there was no fear that war would ever arise between the two countries out of this question, it must inevitably complicate all future disputes, and it was therefore of the greatest importance that there should be a speedy settlement. He traced next, with much fulness of detail, the diplomatic negotiations, beginning with Mr. Adams' first complaint of the precipitate recognition of the belligerent rights of the South, and of the remissness of the British Government in permitting the escape of the "Alabama," and Lord Russell's repudiation of the American claim on both points, down to the acceptance by Lord Stanley (whom, with his party, he sarcastically congratulated on the change of mind which office had caused) of arbitration on the "Alabama" claims, though coupled with an exclusion of the recognition question. He found fault with Lord Stanley for having made this exception, though he confessed a strong conviction that no arbitrator could decide against us on the question of recognition, and that it would be held to be entirely irrelevant to the "Alabama" claims. But there were many people in the United States who held that we were wrong on both points, and as the advantage of arbitration would be to remove all subjects of difference, he regretted that Lord Stanley had unnecessarily insisted on excluding this point. Having combated the argument that it was contrary to our dignity to refer such a question, and shown that no one could have a greater interest in a speedy settlement than ourselves, he concluded by insisting strongly on the duty of this country to be the first to carry out the Declaration of Paris.

Lord Stanley, in replying first to Mr. Shaw-Lefevre's sarcasm, reminded the House that neither he nor Mr. Disraeli had said a word during the war to prejudge its issue. Never professing to be a Northern partisan, he had held throughout that it was our duty not to interfere in a purely internal quarrel, and to treat both sides alike. No man had a stronger sense of the importance to both countries of a settlement of this and all other differences between them. But a tendency always to think ourselves in the wrong and to accuse ourselves of faults which we had never committed, and a readiness to make indiscriminate concessions whenever they were asked, were much to be deprecated. Our duty was to find out what was just, and to do it to the best of our power, not treating our adversaries as children requiring to be humoured and incapable of appreciating arguments which bore against them. Premising that it was not his province to defend Lord Russell, he passed at once to the present aspect of the case, remarking

that there never was a case so difficult precisely to define, because it had been complicated by all sorts of grievances, arising from the well-known fact that the Northerners, expecting from us sympathy and support in their quarrel, would not have been satisfied by the most rigid neutrality. The lapse of time had facilitated the cool discussion of the case, and the state of it was this:—We had offered to refer our liability for the ravages of the “Alabama,” and the United States required that we should also refer the question whether we had rightly recognized the belligerent rights of the South. We had, in fact, conceded all that had been asked for at the commencement of the controversy, and if Lord Russell at the first had agreed to arbitration in the same shape as he himself had, the question of recognition would never have been heard of. But he professed himself entirely unable to decide what the two points had to do with each other. No one would deny that at some time of the war the South were entitled to be considered belligerents. If so, then at what time? Surely if ever they were belligerents it must have been after their great military successes in July, 1861, when for a time they seemed to have the military superiority, and threatened Washington. But the “Alabama” did not escape until April, 1862, and how could our liability for that event be affected by the recognition having taken place six months instead of eleven months before? No Government had insisted more strongly on the sovereign right of a country to recognize the independence of another state than the United States, and in illustrating this Lord Stanley quoted passages from the despatches of American Ministers in reference to the proposed recognition of Hungary by the United States, and the admission of Texan ships into American ports. It did not, therefore, lie in the mouth of the United States to contend that we ought to be fined for exercising this discretion of an independent Government. Suppose the Southern States had achieved their independence, would they have been entitled to claim damages for our tardy recognition of their belligerent rights? And yet the two claims stood entirely on the same footing. Strongly impressing on the House that this was not an ephemeral question, but would set an important precedent, Lord Stanley recapitulated the grounds of his objection to Mr. Seward’s proposal. The question of recognition was irrelevant to the “Alabama” claims; it was a question of state policy, and not of legal obligation; the United States in parallel cases had distinctly refused any responsibility for a similar course; and lastly no arbitrator could be found who would undertake such an indefinite reference. What we had done was to recognize on the 13th of May a certain state of things as constituting a civil war, which Mr. Seward himself, in three public documents, dated nine, twelve, and sixteen days before, had so described, and which the Supreme Court had also declared to be a condition of war. If there was no war there was no blockade, and if there was no blockade, then the capture and condemnation of British ships for breaking the blockade

were illegal. The rupture of negotiations had not come from us; but he did not in the least fear that the question could lead to war between the two countries, for opinion in America was visibly changing in reference to this question of recognition, and no party in America would be insane enough to rush into a costly war in such a cause. No man could be more anxious to settle it than he, and whatever we might have to pay if the decision went against us—though our claims would amount to no inconsiderable set-off—would be cheaply spent in getting a settlement of these nice questions of international law. In conclusion, Lord Stanley intimated that there might still be a solution of the difficulty besides arbitration. Mr. Seward had thrown out hints of something in the nature of a general Commission to which the claims on both sides should be referred, and he had requested him to put the suggestion into a more formal shape. If the substance could be agreed upon, neither the Government nor the country would be disposed to stand too much on the form.

Mr. W. E. Forster did not agree with Mr. Shaw-Lefevre that the negotiations had failed. There had been a hitch, but another solution might be found, and looking to the possible dangers to our commerce by leaving the question unsettled, he suggested that Lord Stanley should intimate his willingness to give indemnity for the past, if the United States would come to some understanding by which the ravages of future Alabamas might be prevented. He did not sympathize with the position which Mr. Seward had taken on the question of recognition, but he held that Lord Stanley had mistaken his meaning. What he contended was, not that the arbitrator should decide on the opportuneness of recognition, but that the United States' Government should be at liberty to urge that as an argument in the consideration of our liability for the "Alabama."

Sir G. Bowyer argued that a neutral had as much right to sell a ship as any other article contraband of war. The belligerent's remedy lay in his right to seize it if he could. The Foreign Enlistment Act, he maintained, did not affect the liability of our Government. It was an Act which could have been put into operation by any private individual, and the Government, in undertaking to enforce its own municipal law, had done a work of supererogation which no foreign State had a right to require from it.

Mr. Mill pointed out that both the preceding speakers had confounded the sale of contraband with the right to make the neutral's territory the basis of operations. Our responsibility rested, not on our municipal law, but on the nonfulfilment of our international duties; and if our municipal law did not correspond with them, foreign States had a right to require its alteration. He agreed with Mr. Forster's interpretation of Mr. Seward's meaning; and as the point had now been reduced to a small compass, and as the offer of arbitration might be taken as a confession that we

owed reparation, he suggested the appointment of a Mixed Commission to ascertain what damages the United States were entitled to claim. The very admission that we owed reparation would of itself settle the disputed point of international law.

Mr. Gladstone admitted that though Lord Russell had refused arbitration, Lord Stanley, in accepting it under altered circumstances, had not compromised the national honour. He professed himself quite unable to gather from Mr. Seward's language how he meant to use the question of recognition, and, differing from Mr. Mill, he denied that we had in any way admitted that reparation was due. The very question to be referred to arbitration was whether we had been guilty of any *laches*, but if we were of opinion that we were in the wrong, it was our duty to offer reparation without waiting for arbitration. In the same manner, he did not agree with Mr. Mill that our acknowledgment that reparation was due would settle the question of international law. That could only be done by an agreement between the leading nations. Expressing his gratification at hearing from Lord Stanley that the matter was not altogether closed, he promised to support him in the attempt to bring it to a satisfactory settlement.

There can be no doubt that the effect of this debate, and in particular of the sensible and temperate speech of Lord Stanley, produced an excellent effect on public opinion on both sides of the Atlantic, and contributed with other causes to the renewal of the endeavours for a pacific settlement of the "Alabama" question, which were happily made before the close of this year.

Shortly after this debate the same subject was introduced in the House of Lords at the instance of Earl Russell, who called the attention of that assembly, on the 20th of March, to the proceedings of the Royal Commission then sitting on the Neutrality Laws, and also moved for copies of correspondence between our Government and that of the United States respecting the "Alabama" and other claims. After briefly introducing the subject, with which he himself as Foreign Secretary under the preceding Government had been so largely concerned, Lord Russell observed that there was no doubt that among a considerable number of members of both Houses of Parliament a disposition had existed not to do justice to the exigencies of the position of the United States' Government in their late struggle. That source of danger had now happily passed away, but instead of it another of a totally different kind had arisen, and that was the difficulty of preserving the dignity of this country against unreasonable and unfounded demands. Under the pressure of these circumstances he feared the Government might be in danger of conceding positions they ought not to concede. Referring to his correspondence with Mr. Adams, to whom, in passing, Lord Russell paid a high tribute of admiration, he went on to say, that since his departure from the Foreign Office, Lord Stanley had consented to submit the whole question to arbitration, and this was a course in which on most

points he could not agree with her Majesty's Government. He adverted to the cases in which cruisers had escaped the vigilance of the Government, and more especially to that of the "Alabama," the flight of which from the Mersey Lord Russell explained, and contended that it was not possible it could have been prevented. The noble lord said every effort was used to detain or capture her when her character and purpose were known; but she got away, and even then she escaped as a harmless vessel, without guns, stores, or powder. After referring to the depredations committed by American cruisers on Portuguese commerce during the war between Spain and Portugal, and the laws then laid down by America, Lord Russell went on to point out how he had acted in the case of the "Alexandra" and of the iron-clads built at Birkenhead, and how the departure of those vessels had been instantly stopped. In those cases he thought they had not, morally speaking, exceeded the law, but certainly they had stopped the ships when they had not sufficient legal proof in a court of law to justify their seizure at the moment. He illustrated the case by the example of war between France and Prussia, and asked what was there to prevent Prussia from ordering, through a merchant at Amsterdam, a vessel to be built in England, and afterwards to go to sea and receive her armament either at sea or in some neutral port. He thought they had gone quite far enough in their neutrality laws, and if they were once to take upon themselves to seize unarmed vessels, they would incur a very grave responsibility.

The Lord Chancellor said, with respect to the first question as to the report of the Commission on the state of the neutrality laws, he had to inform the House that the report was ready. It had been almost unanimously agreed to, and would be laid on the table in a few days. As to the second question, relative to any further correspondence on this subject, there was none whatever; and, with all due respect to Lord Russell, he declined to follow him into the wide field of discussion his remarks might give rise to. The whole question was now open to arbitration, and it was surely no ground for refusing arbitration that they had such an extremely good case that arbitration was unnecessary. As regarded questions of fact, it was also as necessary they should be referred to arbitration as questions of law. On no tenable grounds, therefore, could the Government refuse to accede to the proposal for arbitration. They had therefore conceded on this point what the American Government demanded, but since that they had put forward another claim questioning the legality of our recognition of the belligerent rights of the Southern States at the time we did. To this it was replied that the question was quite irrelevant, as the United States had recognized the Southern States as belligerents long before England did, and if the United States denied this, then this country would have most heavy claims against them for seizing and condemning English vessels for attempting to break a blockade which they now said was not a proper blockade at all.

Lord Westbury, after explaining the nature and extent of the general principles of modern civilization, which went by the name of what is called international law, went on to say that much more than the mere accidental escape of a vessel was required to establish a breach of neutrality. It was the consistent *animus* of a Government which must be proved, and not a single case of so-called neglect. That our right to recognize the Southern States as belligerents should be among the questions to be submitted for arbitration arose from the prevalent idea in the American mind that they were not then engaged in civil war, but only in suppressing a revolt. The conduct of the then Government, however, was not to be judged by the one solitary and accidental instance of the "Alabama," but by the generally fair and impartial policy of the Liberal Government, hampered and harassed as it was on this subject by the action of the Conservatives. He hoped, however, that the negotiations would soon come to an amicable conclusion.

The Lord Chancellor explained that if the topic of recognition were to go before the arbitrators, it would rest with them whether they would receive the evidence on it or not. The negotiations were in fact not broken off. Mr. Seward had prepared a general Commission to investigate all claims, and Lord Stanley had asked for definite information as to the scope of this Commission.

Earl Russell's motion was then withdrawn.

Another motion involving similar questions of international obligation was brought forward in the House of Commons by Mr. W. E. Forster, with reference to the law regulating the allegiance of British subjects emigrating to foreign countries, and especially to the United States of America. According to the maxims of British law, no natural-born subject could divest himself of his allegiance, even though he might have gone to live in a foreign country and become a citizen of such country. This, Mr. Forster observed, was the only country that carried out that principle. By the last census of the United States it appeared that 2,420,000 of the population had been born abroad, and of these 1,600,000 were born in Ireland. When an emigrant had resided five years in the United States he was entitled to become an American citizen, and on doing so he took an oath of allegiance to the United States' Government, and renounced his allegiance to Great Britain. And now we had this difficulty, that some of the Irish emigrants who had been arrested in England claimed the rights of American citizens; those rights were refused them by the law officers of the Crown, and a strong feeling had been roused on the subject in the United States. It had been suggested that there should be a Congress of all nations to settle this subject. It did not, however, seem to him to be a matter for treaty; but there would be great advantages in coming to an understanding with the Government of the United States on the subject.

Sir R. P. Collier supported Mr. Forster's view of the inexpedience

of our English doctrine of unalienable allegiance, and argued that when a man had resided for a certain period in a foreign country, and given unequivocal signs of his intention to settle there, he ought to be no longer considered a British subject, though, in the event of his returning to live here, he might be allowed to resume his citizenship under certain conditions.

Lord Stanley expressed his general concurrence in the tendency of Mr. Forster's views, and was of opinion that the doctrine of indefeasible allegiance, held alike by ourselves and the United States, was indefensible in theory and inapplicable in practice. He pointed out that the right of expatriation had been much overvalued on the other side of the Atlantic, and he stated that our Minister at Washington had been instructed to express our entire willingness to take the subject into consideration, and to meet the United States half way. The political difficulties were very small, but the legal difficulties were considerable, particularly in regard to "repatriation;" and before any arrangement could be made an inquiry by competent legal authorities would be necessary. But whether that inquiry should be national or international he could not at present say.

Sir R. Palmer corrected some inaccurate views held of the statutes on this point, and laid it down that their effect on the children and grandchildren of British subjects residing abroad was merely for beneficial purposes, and that they imposed no burdens, obligations, or responsibilities on them inconsistent with the general principles of international law. He pointed out that all persons, whether natural, naturalized subjects, or aliens, were amenable to the laws of the country in which they happened to reside, and that the Government might disregard altogether their foreign allegiance. He denied that there was so much difference between our law and that of foreign countries as was represented. In no country was the principle recognized that a man could of his own will divest himself of the obligations incident to his original allegiance.

Mr. Buxton advocated the establishment of periodical international congresses for the settlement of these questions. This terminated the discussion.

The policy of this country in reference to the insurrection in Crete, was animadverted upon though not seriously questioned in the House of Lords, the subject having been introduced by Lord Stratheden, who drew attention to the diplomatic correspondence recently made public with reference to Cretan affairs; expressing his opinion that the effect of the proceedings had been to place Great Britain on one side against France and Russia on the other as regarded the Eastern question, and had inflicted a heavy blow on the power of the Ottoman Empire.

The Earl of Malmesbury replied that the policy of her Majesty's Government had been consistent throughout. He deplored the horrors and cruelties which had attended the insurrection, but thought there had been much exaggeration on both sides. The

principle of our Government was non-interference in the affairs of other nations: this rule they had rigidly adhered to, and with this policy in view they had declined to join in "identio" notes with other Powers.

The Duke of Argyll thought that if an "identio" note from other Powers was so serious as to affect the independence of Turkey, the fact of England not joining in it or opposing it had placed this country in a very undesirable position of isolation. He thought the Government had committed an error in refusing to help in withdrawing from Crete the families of the combatants in the struggle, though at the same time he gave Lord Stanley credit for being animated in his decision on this point by the most upright motives. As it was, however, Austria, France, Italy, America, and Russia, all sent vessels to aid in the escape of these poor fugitives. The insurgents still held their own against the Turks, and had done so against all odds for two years. Their lordships might therefore judge what would be the effect of such a state of things upon the other provinces of Turkey if the European Powers did not insist that an "autonomy" should be given to Crete.

Lord Kimberley expressed his entire approval of the policy of Lord Stanley in the course he had pursued with regard to Crete. He had abstained from enforcing on the Porte judicious advice with a pressure which might have produced the same effect as injudicious advice. He had gone in the same direction as the other Powers, but did not feel justified in going as far as they had gone.

Earl Russell paid a handsome tribute of approbation to the policy which Lord Stanley had pursued on this question. He was convinced that the noble lord had acted with much prudence and discretion, and had done his duty by his own country and its allies.

On the same question being shortly afterwards made the subject of comment in the House of Commons, Lord Stanley justified the policy of non-intervention to which we had adhered between Greece and Turkey. He said that the British Government had abstained from urging the separation of Crete from Turkey, because Turkey would never consent to such a step except under pressure amounting to menace, and because, too, if this had been done for Crete, by this time the same question would have arisen with regard to Thessaly and Epirus. But he had never ceased to press for measures of just and equal government for all classes, and a plan of administration had recently been drawn out by the Grand Vizier on principles which, if fairly carried out, must give universal satisfaction. He agreed with those who held that the insurrection had derived its chief support from foreign sources, and particularly from Greece, and to the plea that Crete was necessary to Greece as a defence against Turkey, he replied that she had already found the guarantee of the protecting powers to be her best safeguard. As to the criticisms on the conduct of the Greeks, he remarked that, though they were endowed with fine qualities, and had a brilliant future before them, they had not yet made the best of their territory, and he

recommended them to look for the greatness of their country rather to internal improvements than to the aid of foreign Powers. In the past his policy had been entire neutrality and impartiality, and for the future he declined to give any pledge. But more than one of the European Powers who had dissociated themselves from the action of England in this matter had recently come round to our way of thinking.

A comparison of the merits and disadvantages of British rule in India was instituted by Lord William Hay in an interesting and instructive speech in the House of Commons, the occasion being the publication of a number of communications proceeding from the chief British authorities in answer to a circular addressed to them by the Governor-General, Sir John Lawrence, requesting their opinions as to the acceptableness of the imperial administration to the native population. Considerable diversity of opinion upon this point was exhibited in the answers returned, though the majority were favourable to British rule. Calling attention to this correspondence, and expressing his own dissent from those who gave the preference to native Government, Lord W. Hay contended that the fair comparison should be not between a British State and a native State under our protection, but with a State entirely unconnected with us, or with native rule before we arrived in India, and he maintained that the real difference between British and native rule was that the one was progressive and improving, while the other was retrograde and incapable of improvement. Still he admitted that the gulf between us and the native population was widening, and this he attributed to our tendency to force our own laws and habits upon our subjects, to our carelessness in consulting the wishes of the people, and to our not employing them more generally in the administration of the country. He gave some signal instances of the legislative blunders, unfair taxation, and administrative offences which had been caused by our ignorance of native opinion; and asserting that our safety lay in the happiness and contentment of the people, he advocated a system of government in accordance with the spirit, and not merely the letter, of our own institutions.

Mr. Smollett made some satirical remarks on the motives which had induced Sir John Lawrence to invite the correspondence in question, and spoke in rather slighting terms as to its value. He exhorted Sir Stafford Northcote to be firm in his condemnation of the annexation doctrines.

Mr. Fawcett said no one could deny that our rule in India had increased the material prosperity of the country, and because that was so the Governor-General seemed to think that the people must necessarily be more happy, which was a mistake. The people seemed to think that we had no sympathy with them. In fact, our faults were not of the heart, but of the head. What India was suffering from was centralization. He recommended the gradual initiation of the natives in the art of self-government.

Lord Cranbourne said that the sum and substance of the controversy was this—in our apprehension of the despotism which by the necessity of the case we had established in India, we had fallen into the mistake of over-regulation, and the time of our officials was so taken up in the working of these regulations that they had no leisure to make themselves acquainted with native opinion. The system of official distrust as practised at home was quite out of place in India, and there ought to be a more intimate knowledge of the popular wants. It was better to run the risk of a few mistakes than to lose all elasticity and vigour of government in that country.

Sir S. Northcote summed up the discussion, concluding that our rule in India had been of great advantage by preserving order and protecting the people against civil war, and by the example which we set to the native governments. This, however, he admitted, would be no justification for a policy of annexation, nor for refusing self-administration to native States. He agreed that we ought gradually to accustom the natives to the management of their own affairs.

The Act which was passed in the Session of 1867 for uniting the British North American Provinces in one Confederation, and which was believed by the British public at the time to embody the wishes as well as to conduce to the interests and prosperity of those dependencies, encountered, as afterwards appeared, a very adverse reception from a considerable portion of the inhabitants of Nova Scotia. Their discontent was expressed in the form of energetic remonstrances addressed to the Crown, and also found an influential voice in the British Parliament. The warmth of the opposition evinced by this hardy, but, as was generally supposed, rather apathetic population, to the Confederation in which they had been made partners, excited some surprise in this country. On the 21st February, 1867, a series of resolutions was unanimously passed by the Nova Scotia House of Assembly. It was resolved that the Assembly, which had consented to Confederation, acted in excess of its powers, and had no right to make a grave constitutional change without consulting the people. It was further resolved that even if it possessed such a right, it had not empowered the Delegates to form a Confederation which should omit Newfoundland and Prince Edward's Island,—colonies which had interests resembling those of Nova Scotia, but were now separated from her, while she was bound in an unwilling alliance with the two Canadas. It was resolved, thirdly, that the Delegates did not ensure just provision for the rights and interests of the province, and that "the scheme by them consented to would, if finally confirmed, deprive the people of this province of their rights, liberty, and independence; rob them of their revenues; take from them the regulation of their trade, commerce, and taxes, the management of their railroads and other public property; expose them to an arbitrary and excessive taxation by a Legislature over which they can have no adequate control;

and reduce this hitherto free, happy, and self-governed province to the degraded condition of a dependency on Canada." As if this were not strong enough, it was further resolved that widespread irritation and discontent had been caused by the details of the new Act, and these might be attended by the most disastrous circumstances, "as the loyal people of this province are fully conscious of their rights as British subjects, set an inestimable value on their free institutions, and will not willingly consent to the invasion of those rights, or to be subjected to the dominion of any other power than their lawful and beloved Queen." The passing of the Bill through the Imperial Parliament was imputed to "fraud and deception" committed by persons who misrepresented the public sentiment of the colony, and who, "for reasons which we will not venture to assign, desire that Confederation might be forced upon this province without the consent and against the will of the people." These resolutions, to the number of fifteen, were subsequently draughted into the form of an Address to the Queen, not only with no softening of the language, but rather with increased intensity of expression.

A powerful representative of the remonstrances of Nova Scotia was secured by the dissentient party in the person of Mr. Bright, who presented a petition to the House of Commons, complaining of the absorption of the province into Canada by the Confederation Act, and on a motion for inquiry which he brought forward on the 6th of June, gave effective expression to the grievances of the petitioners. Tracing with much minuteness of detail the history of this question of Confederation for some years past, Mr. Bright maintained that the Nova Scotians had never agreed to any thing beyond an union of the maritime provinces; that the Legislature, by sanctioning the plan, had acted contrary to the wishes of the people; that the assent of the British Parliament had been obtained, if not by fraud, at least by extravagant over-colouring of the facts; and that the Government, when they were pressing the Bill on with indecent haste, knew that Nova Scotia was averse to it. As a proof of the public opinion in the colony, he mentioned that at the last general election out of fifty-seven members elected to the local and the colonial Parliament only three were in favour of Confederation, although the influence of the colonial office, of the military services, of the Canada officials, and the name of the Queen had been used on that side. Mr. Bright proposed an Address to the Crown praying that a Commission might be sent out to inquire into the causes of the discontent felt by the Nova Scotians; and from such an inquiry he anticipated either that some modifications might be made in the Confederation, which would meet the wishes of Nova Scotia, or that the union might be confined to the maritime provinces, or to the Canadas alone. To refuse the inquiry would be to follow up the foolish haste of last year by more perilous obstinacy, and he warned the House in his most solemn tone—deprecating, however, any such unhappy result

—that to turn a deaf ear to these complaints of the colony would be the first step towards throwing it into the arms of the United States.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Baxter, and opposed by

Mr. Adderley, who, admitting that discontent did unfortunately exist in Nova Scotia at the present moment, laid down three propositions,—that the allegations of the petition were entirely unfounded; that if they were true, to send out a Royal Commission would be an insane act; and that whatever discontent existed was being removed by a totally different process. In his turn he entered into the history of the Confederation movement, but drew from it the opposite conclusion that the proposition had originated in Nova Scotia, and that it had been carried out with the thorough consent of the people as well as the Legislature. The Imperial Parliament had acted simply as a ministerial agent to give effect to their wishes, and the Act was almost the *ipsissima verba* of the resolutions of the colonists. Mr. Bright's allegation that the recent elections had been unreservedly against Confederation he contradicted directly, and the discontent which did exist was not greater than was perhaps natural at the commencement of such an experiment, and not greater than existed in the United States when first the Federation was established. To send out a Royal Commission would be to embarrass and paralyze the Colonial Government at a critical moment, and would destroy the monetary credit of the dominion. But the difficulties were rapidly being overcome, and in a little time longer Mr. Adderley confidently expected they would disappear altogether. The influence of Nova Scotia had been almost dominant in the Dominion Parliament; numerous changes had been made in favour of the maritime provinces, and their Free-trade policy was getting the better of the Protectionist leanings of Canada. Confederation was the only alternative of annexation to the United States, for these provinces could not remain for ever in an independent position; and he earnestly urged the House not to sanction the first step towards a reactionary policy.

Mr. Cardwell, lamenting the existence of discontent, appealed to the history of the Confederation to show that, so far from Nova Scotia being taken by surprise, the first proposals had proceeded entirely from her, and it was Canada which had long continued to hold back. When the union of the provinces was carried out it was but natural that discontent should arise from the dislocation of interests and prejudices, and from the assimilation of tariffs and other changes, but it would pass away, as a similar feeling had passed away in New Brunswick. But he protested strongly against a step which would assume that the voice of the Legislature did not represent the people, and would be a hazardous interference with colonial self-government.

The motion was supported by Mr. Aytoun and Mr. Gorst, and opposed by Mr. Karslake; and after a forcible reply from Mr. Bright, was rejected on a division by 183 to 87.

A few weeks later Lord Stratheden took up the cause of the Nova Scotia petitioners in the House of Lords. The noble lord stated at length the grievances of which Nova Scotia complained, and urged the danger of leaving a colony in such a state of chronic discontent when its proximity to the United States might lead to its separation, not only from Canada, but Great Britain itself. No colony had shown more persistent and devoted loyalty than Nova Scotia, and if their lordships hoped that by doing nothing the discontent of the colonists would pass away, he feared they were much mistaken. He advocated a Commission of Inquiry as a means of conciliation for the purpose of examining into the causes of the alleged dissatisfaction.

The Duke of Buckingham, Secretary of State for the Colonies, while regretting that the notice of motion had been so long before the House without action being taken on it, pointed out that the alleged grievances arose entirely from the course adopted by the first Canadian Parliament, and these had been completely removed by the action of the succeeding Parliament. The feeling in Nova Scotia was far from being unanimous against the Confederation; in fact, it was the feeling of a small majority. He pointed out the great advantages which Nova Scotia would derive by joining with her sister colonies. He deprecated any inquiry by Commission, and declared that her Majesty's Government would do all that they could in a spirit of conciliation towards the province, and would use their influence in Canada in favour of a similar policy.

The Earl of Carnarvon vindicated the course which the Government had taken in 1867 (he having been at that time the Colonial Secretary) and cited dates and facts to show that the province was not taken by surprise, but that the course adopted had been approved by the other provinces, and sanctioned by the Nova Scotia Parliaments. The discussion was continued by Earl Russell, the Marquis of Normanby, Lords Lyveden, Lyttelton, and other peers, who were opposed to any Commission of Inquiry. The Marquis of Clanricarde was in favour of that step. Ultimately Lord Stratheden declined to divide the House, and the motion dropped.

On the 28th of April the news of the entirely successful result of the Abyssinian expedition, the capture of Magdala, and the death of King Theodore reached this country. The intelligence was received with the liveliest satisfaction. The complete triumph of our arms under circumstances of great difficulty, in an unknown and distant region, was enhanced by the reflection that the war was undertaken with no object of selfish ambition or desire of national gain or glory, but with much reluctance, in obedience to a sense of duty to our fellow-subjects, and in the interest of humanity. The admirable manner in which the expedition was organized and conducted, combining prudence with daring, and crowning with success a romantic enterprise without any cost of life on our own part, elicited the cordial approbation of the public

at home, and warm feeling of gratitude and admiration towards Sir Robert Napier, the commander to whose skill and energy the result was mainly due. Nor was it an insignificant part of the general satisfaction that an undertaking which every one knew to be of a very costly nature, and from which some anticipated a heavy financial sacrifice, was thus brought to a termination earlier than even sanguine persons had ventured to anticipate, and under circumstances which made the outlay appear even small by comparison with the lustre and prestige which the nation derived from so signal a success. The details of these transactions so honourable to the British arms, will be found in their proper place in another part of this volume. We have here to record the reception which the gratifying tidings met with at home, and the steps taken in Parliament to do honour to the actors in the enterprise. Upon the 2nd of July the despatches from the General Commanding-in-Chief having after some delay been received in England, the thanks of both Houses of Parliament were proposed to be given to the leader of the expedition and his officers and soldiers. The motion was proposed in the House of Lords by the Earl of Malmesbury, who moved "that the thanks of the House be given to Sir Robert Napier, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., for the exemplary skill with which he planned, and the distinguished courage, energy, and perseverance with which he conducted, the Abyssinian expedition, and rescued the British envoy and other subjects from captivity. Also, that the thanks of the House be given to Commodore Heath, R.N., C.B., for the indefatigable zeal and great ability with which he conducted the naval operations connected with the transport of troops and stores, on which the success of the expedition materially depended. Also, that the thanks of the House be given to Sir C. Staveley, K.C.B.; Major-General G. Malcolm, C.B.; Major-General Russell, Brigadier-General W. Merewether, C.B.; and the other officers of the army and navy, for the gallantry and ability with which they executed the various services which they were called upon to perform throughout these various operations. That the House highly acknowledges and approves the discipline, gallantry, and endurance displayed by the petty officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the navy and army, both European and native, during these operations, and that the same be signified to them by their respective commanding officers."

Earl Russell, in seconding the motion, said the expedition was undertaken at the right moment, when forbearance had reached its limit, and nothing was left but to vindicate the honour of the country. This had been done in a most triumphant manner, and in Sir Robert Napier the British army had another name to add to the roll of distinguished men who had helped to carry the fame of England over the globe. When, however, he called to mind the character of the invaded country, and the season in which the operations had been conducted, he thought it was a merciful interposition of Providence that the expedition had not been pro-

longed. Although not included in the vote, he felt bound to say that in his opinion the Government were also entitled to the gratitude of the public.

The Duke of Cambridge characterized the expedition as a series of unbroken successes from beginning to end. Officers and men, from the highest to the lowest, had done their duty, whilst their chief had shown himself not only competent to command, but to express in modest and interesting language the exploits of his force. That morning, when he had the honour of shaking Sir Robert Napier by the hand, the impression produced on his mind was that the gallant general thought nothing of himself but every thing of his troops.

The Earls of Longford and Ellenborough having also expressed their admiration of the qualities of the force employed,

The Earl of Derby joined in the general tone of approval and gratitude that had welcomed the return of the victors from Abyssinia. In his opinion no expedition had ever been undertaken by a Government with a higher sense of its absolute and unavoidable necessity. Its object had been successfully attained, and Sir Robert Napier and the troops under his command were entitled to the gratitude of their country for the distinguished services they had performed.

The motion was unanimously adopted.

In the House of Commons the First Lord of the Treasury made a similar motion. Mr. Disraeli in his speech described the enterprise as one of the most remarkable military successes of the century, and dwelling upon the conduct of the commander, observed that he had exhibited as much diplomatic ability as military skill. The present was not the first or the second time that Sir Robert Napier had received the thanks of Parliament for his services; happy was the man who had thrice thus been honoured by his country. Passing next to the services of the naval force under Commodore Heath, he praised the promptitude, skill, and efficiency displayed in buoying and lighting the Abyssinian waters, transporting troops and stores, supplying the army with water, and organizing and equipping a rocket brigade which took part in the whole of the operations. There had been instances of rapid marches and triumphant field operations that had produced greater sensation; but if regard were had to the exhibition of military virtues, he doubted whether the qualities of patience, endurance, and good temper, combined with gentleness and docility under the most trying circumstances, had ever been more strikingly exemplified by any troops. He congratulated the country, not so much on the success, as on the character of the expedition. When it was first announced foreign critics were not wanting to attribute sinister designs to this country; but the sequel showed that we had asserted the purity of our purpose in an age of selfishness, and had shown how a great nation could vindicate her motives of humanity. He felt persuaded that the expedition to Abyssinia would add lustre

to the name of England, and beneficially influence the future history of the world.

Mr. Gladstone, who seconded the motion, said that he did not claim for the expedition precisely the same kind of fame as that which attached to actions in which desperate conflicts were waged with an equal or nearly equal valour—between nations or armies possessed of all the resources of modern warfare; but he reminded the House that we lived in an age in which, if it could not be said of the soldier, it must be said of the commander, that mere fighting, however arduous, mere tactics, and mere strategy, had become—though, perhaps, still vital and essential—almost a secondary part, certainly by no means the whole apparatus required to make a successful general. The conflict had been carried on with nature, with distance, with climate, and with all the diversities and difficulties presented by one of the most peculiar portions of the earth's surface. Referring next to the action of the Government at home, the right honourable gentleman said that the country was indebted to them for the wise choice of a commander, for the unsparing liberality with which they had made the resources of the country available for the purpose in view, and for the care and forethought with which all the necessary provisions had been made. Especially were we indebted to the Secretary of State for India; and, lastly, we were indebted to the Government for the firmness and decision with which, from first to last, they had persisted in acting in accordance with the enlightened mind of the nation in confining the operations to the legitimate purpose of the expedition. Whilst acknowledging that all had done their part, it was, he continued, impossible not to dwell with peculiar interest on the character of the man who occupied the foremost place on the canvas. Without him we could scarcely have hoped that the expedition would stand upon record as a rare example among those occasions when a nation resorted to the bloody arbitrament of war, in which not one drop had been added to the cup of human suffering that forethought or humanity could spare, and in which the severest critic would find nothing to except to.

The resolution was adopted by acclamation.

It remained for the Crown and nation to express in a substantial manner their appreciation of the services of the leader of the Abyssinian expedition. The Sovereign conferred on Sir Robert Napier the dignity of a peerage, with the title of Lord Napier of Magdala, and a message was sent to the two Houses of Parliament recommending that provision should be made to enable the new peer to support that dignity. A resolution granting an annuity of 2000*l.* a year out of the Consolidated Fund to himself and the next surviving heir male of his body was moved and carried, without a dissentient voice, in both Houses.

Another occurrence in which Parliament was called upon to address the Crown not in terms of congratulation but of sympathy and regret, was of a very different complexion from the glorious

events last referred to. Nearly at the same time as the news arrived of the fall of the stronghold of King Theodore, the country was shocked and dismayed at the intelligence from Australia that his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, visiting in his voyage in the "Galatea" our Australian settlements, had been shot in the back, while attending some festive meeting at Sydney, by the hand of an assassin, and dangerously wounded. The public indignation at the crime and anxiety for the life of the young and popular prince were excited to a very high degree, and the feeling was not abated until by the next advices from the colony it was learned that the royal patient, though narrowly escaping a mortal injury, had been successfully treated for the wound, and that there was good reason to anticipate in due time his complete recovery. The sympathy of the nation in the feelings of the Queen was promptly indicated by addresses moved immediately on the arrival of the painful tidings in both Houses of Parliament.

Lord Malmesbury asked the House of Lords to congratulate her Majesty on the providential and happy escape of his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh from the attack of a cowardly assassin. The attempt made was one most diabolical, and was as cowardly as it was purposeless. Purposeless it was in every sense, for it could have no political effect whatever, either on the dynasty or the Government. It was simply a murderous attempt on the life of a young prince who had never connected himself with political parties of any kind. He moved, therefore, that a message of condolence from their Lordships' House be forwarded to her Majesty, who, the House would be glad to hear, had received the painful intelligence of her son's wound with the firmness and courage which distinguished her and all her race.

Earl Russell said he entirely concurred in the address. It was plain now that the Fenians, finding themselves powerless to effect any thing else, had resorted to the dastardly system of assassinating unoffending persons in the hope of exciting terror. The address was voted *nem. con.*

Similar proceedings took place in the House of Commons.

Mr. Disraeli, in proposing the address, said that if any thing could aggravate the atrocity of the act it was the occasion on which it was perpetrated, when his Royal Highness was fulfilling one of those offices which are the most graceful appanages of his rank. "We flatter ourselves that we live in an age of progress, but there appear to be cycles in our progress in which the worst passions and habits of distant ages are revived. Some distant centuries ago the world was tortured with the conviction that some mysterious power existed which could command in every camp, and court, and capital, a poniard at its disposal. It seems that at this time too some dark confederacy of that kind is spreading over the world. All that I can say is that I regret that for a moment such acts should have been associated with the name of Ireland. I am convinced myself, as I have expressed before in this House, that the

imputation is unjust. I believe that these acts, and the characters who perpetrate them, are the distempered consequences of civil wars and disorganized societies, and that when their dark invasion first touched Ireland, the nation as a whole entirely repudiated them. The manner in which, in that land, another son (his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales) of the Queen has recently been received has proved that the loyalty of the Irish nation is unchanged and undimmed, and that those amiable and generous feelings which have always been characteristic of the Irish people flourish with the same vigour that we have before recognized. I trust that under these circumstances I may move, "That an humble address be presented to her Majesty the Queen, as an expression of the sorrow and indignation with which the House has heard of the atrocious attempt to assassinate his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh while on a visit to her Majesty's loyal Australian colonies; of their heartfelt congratulations to her Majesty on the preservation of his Royal Highness from material injury; and, further, to assure her Majesty of the sympathy of this House under her Majesty's present anxiety, and of their earnest hope for the speedy recovery of his Royal Highness."

Mr. Gladstone seconded the address, which was unanimously adopted. Her Majesty returned to it the following answer:—"I receive with deep satisfaction your sympathizing address. The attempt upon the life of my son, the Duke of Edinburgh, has, I feel, only further aroused the loyalty of my Australian subjects, so heartily displayed in his reception. I am very sensible of the Divine protection afforded him, and in my anxiety still trust in it; while in this as in all trials I derive consolation and support from the affectionate attachment of my Parliament and people."

The wretched author of this nefarious attempt, one O'Farrell, an emigrant from Ireland, suffered the penalty due to his crime at Sydney, where the loyal feelings of the inhabitants towards the British Crown, and their indignation at the outrage which seemed to reflect dishonour on their soil, were kindled to a high pitch. The prisoner appears to have met his death with courage. He left behind him a letter in which he expressed extreme sorrow for what he had done, and denied that his act was connected with any political organization. There was not a single human being in existence, he said, who had the slightest knowledge of his project. The statement that there was a Fenian organization in New South Wales had no foundation, except perhaps mere hearsay. "From brooding over the wrongs of Ireland, I became," he says in conclusion, "excited, and filled with enthusiasm on the subject, and it was when under the influence of those feelings that I attempted to perpetrate the deed for which I am now justly called upon to suffer."

The following speech, which was made by the Duke of Edinburgh at an entertainment given by the Governor of New South

Wales at Sydney, just before his Royal Highness left that colony under the advice of his medical attendants for England, shows the sentiments of a courageous and high-spirited prince on the occurrence which had caused so much public excitement. The company which his Royal Highness addressed on this occasion, consisted of most of the leading persons in Sydney, the chief civil and military functionaries, and other individuals prominent by their wealth or station in that society. A spirit of the most cordial loyalty, enhanced by the sympathy felt for the youthful prince who had so narrowly escaped a tragical doom, pervaded the assembly. The health of her Majesty the Queen was drunk with great enthusiasm; that of the Prince himself was greeted with equally ardent feelings. It was understood that his Royal Highness had expressed his desire that the life of O'Farrell should be spared, but the authorities in the colony wisely thought that it was a case in which the law should take its course. In acknowledging the toast of his health the Duke of Edinburgh spoke as follows:—

“Gentlemen: I have no doubt you will allow me to read the few words that I desire to say to you, as I do not feel equal to the task of speaking extempore. In returning you my best thanks for drinking my health, I must express my regret at having to bid you farewell; and I take this opportunity of thanking you for the enthusiastic and hospitable manner in which I have been received and entertained in this as well as all the Australian colonies. The universal manifestations of loyalty to the Queen and attachment to her person and throne have ere this been made known to her Majesty, and cannot fail to have given her the liveliest pleasure. I must now, however, allude to the unfortunate occurrence connected with myself which marred your festivities and cast a temporary gloom over the community. I sincerely regret, on your part, that there should have been any one incident during my sojourn among you which should have detracted from the general satisfaction which I believe my visit to Australia has given. The event, however, cannot in any degree shake my conviction of the loyalty of the colonists at large, nor her Majesty's confidence in her Australian subjects. Indeed, the meetings and expressions of sentiments which have been called forth by the recent attempt on my life will show their fellow-subjects at home and the world at large that they not only have loyalty, but affection for their Queen and her family. If there is any disaffection tending to disloyalty among any community in any section of this portion of her Majesty's dominions, it will be the duty of the Government to put it down, and I am certain that here it will receive every support from all classes. Through the merciful interposition of Providence the injury I received was but slight, and I believe no further evil consequences are to be anticipated from the wound. It has, however, been considered that I shall be unequal to any great exertion for some time, and therefore it has been decided that it would be most advisable for me to return home direct. It is a

great disappointment for me not to be able to visit New Zealand, and I am afraid it will also very much disappoint the people there. In thanking you once more for your kindness to me during my visit, I must tell you how much I have enjoyed it, and regret that it comes to an end to-day. Before I conclude I will ask you to join me in a toast. I propose 'Prosperity to the Colony of New South Wales;' and as this is the last opportunity I shall have of addressing an assembly of Australians, I beg to couple with it the toast, 'Prosperity to all the Australian Colonies.'"

Upon the Duke's return to England the public was highly gratified to learn that he had entirely recovered from the effects of his wound.

CHAPTER VII.

RELIGION AND EDUCATION—Settlement of the long-contested Church-rate question—Review of the various plans proposed—Four Bills are brought in by different Members—Statement of Mr. Gladstone's scheme for abolishing the compulsory payment—Great majority in the House of Commons in favour of the principle of this Bill—Opposition of Mr. Henley and Mr. Newdegate—The Bill is passed and sent to the Lords—The Earl of Malmesbury proposes to refer it to a Select Committee—Earl Russell, with some hesitation, consents to this course—Some important modifications are introduced in Committee—Effect of these alterations stated by Lord Russell, who accedes to the Amendments—Lord Derby also expresses his assent—The Bishops of Oxford and Gloucester and Bristol protest against the measure—The amendments moved are negatived and the Bill passed—On the motion of Mr. Gladstone the Lords' Amendments are agreed to by the other House—*National Education*—Bill brought in by Mr. H. A. Bruce to authorize compulsory rating for the purpose of education—The Duke of Marlborough, President of the Council, proposes a measure on behalf of the Government—Statement of his plan—It is approved by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and other Peers, but is opposed by the Earl of Airlie, the Duke of Argyll, and Lord Kimberley—The second reading is passed, but in consequence of the pressure of public business the Bill is eventually withdrawn—The same result befalls Mr. Bruce's Bill—Vote for Public Education, moved by Lord Robert Montagu—His statement as to the progress of national instruction and extension of schools—Comments of Mr. H. A. Bruce, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Hubbard, and other members on the Ministerial statement—*Religious Tests at the Universities*—Mr. J. D. Coleridge renews his attempt to carry a Bill for abolishing these restrictions—Important debate on the second reading, which is carried by 198 to 140—The farther progress of the Bill is stopped by the pressure of business—Bill for restraining the excess of Ritual observances in the Church brought in by Lord Shaftesbury—The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Marquis of Salisbury and other Peers oppose the measure as premature, and the "previous question" being moved by Lord Derby, it is lost—*Disendowment of the Church in the West Indies*—A Bill for this purpose brought in by the Government suggests a parallel with Mr. Gladstone's policy as to the Irish Church—Controversy on this question between the Earl of Carnarvon and the Lord Chancellor—The Bill is passed—*Miscellaneous Measures* passed or rejected before the close of the Session—The Promissory Oaths Bill, the Railway Companies Bill, the Electric Telegraph Government Purchase Bill, and the Public Schools Bill are passed—The Sale of Liquors on Sundays Bill, and the Metropolitan Meat Market Bill are withdrawn—Parliament is prorogued by Commission on July 31st—Her Majesty's Speech.

THE Session of 1868, which was in various other respects a memorable one, happily witnessed the conclusion of a long-pending con-

troversy, by bringing to a legislative settlement the much-vexed question of Church-rates. This fruitful topic of discussion and agitation, of which all parties were thoroughly wearied, was laid to rest in a manner which if not satisfactory to all minds, appeared on the whole a preferable result to that chronic irritation and suspense which the previous state of the law had engendered, and which there seemed no other prospect of allaying. The schemes for settling the problem, which had at different times during the last few years been propounded in a more or less formal shape, were of various characters. The Conservatives some time ago had proposed to exempt any one from payment on his declaring himself a Dissenter, and accepting some consequent disqualifications. This scheme, under various modifications, had been proposed Session after Session, and had of late been promoted by Mr. Hubbard and others who acted with him. It was forcibly objected to this plan that it stamped or "ticketed" as Dissenters a distinct party in the parish, and tended to cut them off from joining the Church, or at least threw obstacles in the way of their conformity. Mr. Bright again had suggested that all that was necessary was to abolish the compulsory machinery of summons and bailiff, leaving the law in other respects *in statu quo*. This idea appears to have caught the mind of Mr. Gladstone, and to have suggested to him the rudiments of the plan which he propounded in the present year as the basis of a settlement. The situation of the Conservative party in office, and other circumstances, combined to render the plan acceptable to a large majority of the House of Commons, and to produce, after certain modifications of detail, its ultimate adoption.

At an early period of the Session no less than four Bills on the subject were together offered to the House for their selection: first, that of Mr. Harcastle for total and unconditional abolition; next, that of Mr. Hubbard, which proposed an optional exemption under the conditions above described; thirdly, a plan of Mr. Newdegate for fixing the liability to the rate as a compulsory charge upon property instead of upon persons; and fourthly, the measure proposed by Mr. Gladstone.

The latter Bill came on first for discussion on the second reading, when Mr. Gladstone gave a short explanation of its provisions. He said that it would abolish henceforth all legal proceedings for the recovery of Church-rates, except in cases of rates already made, or where money had been borrowed on the security of the rates; but it permitted voluntary assessments to be made, and all agreements to make such payments on the faith of which any expenditure had been incurred would be enforceable in the same manner as contracts of a like character in any court of law or equity. No one who had not paid would be able to vote on any question relating to voluntary assessment. Mr. Gladstone expressed a strong hope that the Bill would elicit such a concurrence of opinion as would lead to a satisfactory settlement, but intimated that if it

failed he should no longer stand in the way of the total abolitionists. To Dissenters the Bill offered an abandonment of the principle of compulsion, while to Churchmen it offered the advantage of retaining and extending the existing machinery by which, in many cases, voluntary rates were now levied, without the smallest idea of resorting to compulsion. Explaining the machinery of the clauses, he showed that agreements to pay a voluntary assessment, if any expenditure had been incurred upon them, would be in the same position as contracts to subscribe to a hospital, to a religious society, or a Dissenting place of worship, and could be enforced in a court of equity. To those who objected to the principle of total abolition, he pointed out that but for Lord Derby's abolition of vestry cess in Ireland, more than thirty years ago, the Established Church of Ireland would have ceased to exist long since.

Mr. Henley asserted that the Bill would be an aggravation of the evils of total abolition, and would put so many difficulties in the way of collecting voluntary subscriptions, that he preferred Mr. Hardcastle's Bill. Mr. Gladstone had made it quite clear that any man who agreed to pay a rate might be made a party to a Chancery suit if somebody else failed to carry out their agreement, and this was not a prospect likely to stimulate voluntary contributions.

Mr. Gilpin promised to support the Bill provided it was accepted by the Conservative party as a satisfactory compromise.

Colonel Barttelot did not wholly approve of the Bill, but supported it as containing materials for a settlement of the question.

Lord Cranbourne said Mr. Henley adopted the tone of "all or nothing," but he could not forget that from the same hand from which this Bill came another measure on another subject was offered which was rejected, and in consequence a much more extensive measure had been carried. He thought it wise to accept this offer, because they might go farther and fare worse.

After some further observations from various members the Bill was read a second time.

The other three Bills were on a subsequent day passed through the same stage, but with the understanding that they should then be postponed for a time while that of Mr. Gladstone was proceeded with in Committee. The first clause of this Bill contained the pith of the measure, the abolition of compulsory Church-rates. Mr. Henley insisted on dividing the House on this clause, which was carried by an overwhelming majority—167 against 30. The other clauses underwent some amendments, chiefly of a formal kind, and the Bill passed through Committee. The third reading was affirmed, a division being called for by Mr. Newdegate, by 131 to 28.

On its being sent to the House of Lords it was proposed by Lord Malmesbury that the Bill should be referred to a Select Com-

mittee. Earl Russell, under whose care it was placed, professed his willingness to assent to this course, but on the understanding that the principle was admitted, and that there would be no attempt to shelve the measure for the Session. Lord Malmesbury having assented that the Committee should not enter into the general question of abolishing Church-rates, the House agreed to the motion.

The result of the reference to the Committee was that although the abolition of the compulsory Church-rate was retained, considerable modifications were made in the machinery of the Bill, the Lord Chancellor taking an active part in the process of amendment. The effect of these alterations was clearly stated by Earl Russell upon the occasion of the House resolving itself into a Committee on the Bill as amended. His lordship said, "My impression is that a Bill designed simply to abolish Church-rates unconditionally would, in effect, differ very little from what will be entailed by the passing of this. A few cases will occur of parishes in which there are no resident landlords, but only poor farmers, having a large and expensive church to maintain; in such cases local contributions will be few, but here the Church Building Society and other societies will step in and advance the necessary funds. This is merely my impression of what will occur, though of course the Bill makes no allusion to such cases. It is stated in the preamble that Church-rates have practically ceased in a great many parishes; this is, no doubt, perfectly true, and the first clause proceeds to enact that there shall be no power whatever to compel payment of Church-rates. To that first clause the Government agrees, and therefore in principle the prayer of Dissenters is, in fact, complied with. The object of the House of Commons was to distinguish between ordinary payment and payment compelled by Act of Parliament, in which latter case all will agree payment should continue, because such payments are not properly Church-rates, but are equivalent to commutation of tithe. There are some other cases which may be doubtful, and no matter what arrangements we may make, it is impossible that we can absolutely prevent disputes. All that we can do is to reserve Church-rates which are really commuted tithes, and to take our chance as to any disputes that may arise, and as to the necessity of future legislation, which is not unlikely to occur, especially as there are no less than 700 Acts of Parliament, some of them of a very difficult and intricate nature, in which Church-rates are mentioned. So much with regard to that portion of the Bill which relates to the abolition of compulsory Church-rates. The other part of the measure relates to voluntary contributions for the repair of the fabric and for the other purposes for which rates have been levied. Now the Bill allows vestries to continue the making and receiving of rates, the only difference being that the power of compelling payment is taken away. A vestry may decide that a certain sum is required, and persons may voluntarily pay at a certain rate in the pound. I think that in

this respect the Select Committee have made an improvement, for they retain the vestry, the name and powers of which are well known; and I can conceive that in numerous parishes where Church-rates are at present made no great change will occur in consequence of the absence of compulsion. Things are far more likely to go on as at present under these circumstances than if a new body were constituted, as was proposed by the other House. Then there is a clause empowering the incumbent and two householders, one appointed by the patron and one by the bishop, to act as trustees and receive any bequests, donations, or contributions for ecclesiastical purposes, which funds they may hand over to the churchwardens, to be applied to such ecclesiastical purposes as they may specify. That is a provision which will come into operation in some cases, but I think that the Church Building Society or the churchwardens, will generally apply the contributions they may receive. The noble and learned lord on the woolsack has given notice of a further clause, requiring the trustees to lay before the vestry an annual statement of their receipts and expenditure. Upon the whole this is a Bill which fulfils its object; for while abolishing compulsory rates, it empowers the vestry to make voluntary rates, and it also empowers trustees to receive contributions. As to its general effect, it is, I trust, the settlement of a controversy which ever since 1833 or 1834 has given rise to much ill will and litigation, and therefore the termination of such a dispute is a consummation devoutly to be wished. Moreover, there is much greater anxiety than used to exist to preserve ancient fabrics which are objects of reverence. Such feelings are not confined to members of the Church, for many Protestant Dissenters, members of whose families have been married in churches in past times, would be most unwilling to see those edifices fall into decay, and when the obnoxious compulsory powers are removed I believe they will contribute voluntarily. I know a case, indeed, in which a Dissenter gave 100*l.* each to two churches, and I believe such cases will be more numerous after the passing of this measure. I hope, therefore, your lordships will adopt the Bill in its present form, and send it down to the House of Commons. I believe Protestant Dissenters, both those who are members of the House of Commons and others who have taken a leading part in the controversy, are satisfied with a measure of this kind, and I am sure it will be a great advantage if we can pass such a Bill by the general consent of both Houses and of both Churchmen and Dissenters. It is much better to settle the question in this way than to leave it open, to be settled, perhaps, hereafter with angry feelings, when one party will be elated by victory and the other will feel sore under defeat. I shall not myself propose any alteration in the Bill as settled by the Select Committee."

The Marquis of Salisbury complained that the Committee had struck out several of the provisions which had been originally in the Bill for the protection of the Church; for instance, the pro-

vision by which a Dissenting churchwarden was restrained from administering the voluntary rate, and the compulsory collection of the contributions when once promised to the rate.

The Lord Chancellor thought that although the compulsory levying of Church-rates was abolished, yet the Bill left untouched the parochial machinery—*minus* that power—for making Church-rates in those numerous parishes where no objection was made.

Lord Derby expressed his willingness to accept the measure as a compromise. "Although," he said, "I retain my objections to doing away with the compulsory power of levying Church-rates, yet, at the same time, the principle of the first clause having been adopted by your lordships, and accepted also by a large majority of the House of Commons, I think it would be useless to struggle against such a majority in both Houses. That point being settled, I will further say that it is my earnest desire that this question should be brought to a satisfactory issue in the present Session, and should not be left open for any further agitation or to be any cause of bitterness among the new constituencies. In many respects I think the Bill has been amended by the Select Committee."

The Archbishop of York approved of the changes which had been made by the Select Committee, as did Lord Lyveden; but the Bishop of Oxford expressed a different opinion. The right reverend prelate, after protesting against the notion that the imposition of a tax upon property could be regarded as a persecution of Dissenters, expressed his opinion as to the amended Bill as follows:—"It is admitted that the compulsory payment of Church-rates is to be given up, and the question before us is the Bill. Although considerable improvements have been made in it, especially in its earlier portions, in one or two of its principal provisions it has been seriously injured, and I shall feel bound to propose amendments upon the report. First, as to the question concerning the settling of future rates by those who have not paid the last. The Lord Chancellor seemed to think that it would be a provocation to Dissenters to object to a voluntary Church-rate being made if those who had not paid the rates would not be parties to settling the way in which a new voluntary rate should be made. The Bill that contained that clause was a compromise and a compact between the Dissenters and the House of Commons, and the representatives of the Church of England there. It was most thoroughly considered by the Dissenting members of the House of Commons, who, I must say, in this matter seem to have kept faith in the most praiseworthy manner with those who had the management of this Bill, and they agreed that it was a clause to which Dissenters had not any right to object. Neither do I think it is possible to say they have. Any person can come again into the voluntary Church-rate vestry by paying his own share of the rate for the year past; he does not

lose any right; it is not that he must pay it now or never. At any time he can join that body which settles whether there shall or shall not be a voluntary rate by paying a subscription equal to the amount of the last rate. The main objection always taken to Church-rates has been the compulsion, and not the amount. Those who objected to pay them have often said they would willingly give double the amount as a free gift, but they objected to the power to compel them to pay any thing. That is entirely taken away by the Bill, and therefore there is no temptation to come the first time and object to the starting of the machinery. On the contrary, their representatives in Parliament have agreed to start it, and I think the probability is that, receiving this as a sacrifice on the part of the Church, and gratified that it has given up the power of compulsion, they will be more ready than others to start the new machinery fairly. But the objection that it is new machinery I deny, for in nineteen cases out of twenty the vestry will be precisely the same, and the rate will be made as before, with this one difference, that the payment of it cannot be enforced. The transition from the existing to the future legal state is, therefore, a simple matter. I believe that the vestry will be an increasing rather than a dying-away constituency, especially in country parishes, where farmers will not like to be left out. But suppose the number of payers diminishes every year, you will realize a state of inanition just as you would if opponents prevented the starting of the machinery. It does seem to me it is a fundamental error in the Bill, as altered by the Select Committee, that it takes away the one thing which would work well. Whilst in the country parishes there would be very little change, how would the Bill work in the towns where the rate has been refused? If the Bill passes through Committee I shall feel bound to move several amendments on the report being brought up."

In pursuance of this notice the right reverend prelate, on the next stage of the measure, moved to insert a clause providing that no person should be allowed to vote upon the expenditure of any money for Church purposes who had not contributed to the rate levied for the same.

The Archbishop of York opposed this amendment as calculated to alienate waverers from the Church, and it was rejected by a majority of forty-six peers against thirteen.

On the question that the Bill do pass, certain amendments having been made at the instance of the Bishop of London and the Lord Chancellor, some parting words were uttered at the last stage of this long-pending controversy.

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol wished, in a few sentences, to enter his protest against the passing of this measure. In saying "non-content" he was uttering the sentiments of others as well as his own. He protested against the passing of the Bill, because it was the giving up of a great principle. By passing this Bill they were giving up a portion of the heritage of the Church. He knew

that these terms sounded very old-fashioned; but he thought it not amiss that a voice should be raised in favour of old and constitutional principles. He protested earnestly but respectfully against this Bill. As it had come up from the Commons, it contained provisions which would have put the Church in a better position than that which she would occupy under the measure as it was about to pass. He held that a Bill for the simple and unconditional abolition of Church-rates would be better than this. If injustice were to be done, it would be better that it should be done by a Bill which would not have the appearance of doing what was right. If Church-rates were abolished altogether, the Church would at once have to organize a system by which a substitute might be procured. The passing of such a measure as this would place her in a less satisfactory position.

Lord Lyttelton said that when many of their lordships hoped rather than expected that the Bill would enable them to hear no more of that question for a long time to come, he must express his entire conviction that the whole agitation against Church-rates and the proposal for their total abolition were as totally unfounded in justice as any movement that ever occurred in this country, except upon a ground that would go a great deal farther, and would extend even to the abolition of the Established Church. The repeal of Church-rates had been advocated on considerations of expediency, with a view to conciliate the Dissenters; but he doubted whether it would have that result. He had very slight hope indeed that this Bill would lead to any good, yet as it had been agreed to by both sides, he could not offer any opposition to it.

The Lord Chancellor disagreed both with the noble lord and the right reverend prelate as regarded the comparative disadvantage of the Bill as it stood and a measure for the complete abolition of Church-rates. He thought the present measure very much better for the Church; and he had a sanguine hope that in many parishes in the country it would work very satisfactorily. If there was a parish in the country which thought it had got a better machinery of its own than that provided by the Bill, it would be perfectly at liberty to employ that machinery; and that he deemed a merit in the Bill.

The Bill was then passed. On its being returned to the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone, though he intimated his doubts whether all the amendments made by the Peers would be found to have improved it, declared his willingness to accept the measure as it stood, and it was passed without further discussion, and became law.

The subject of national education was one of those which the Sovereign in her Message at the commencement of the Session had recommended to the attention of Parliament. Two measures for promoting this great object were shortly afterwards presented to the Legislature, but the circumstances which arose to absorb the time of Parliament and shorten the period of its sitting neces-

sitated the abandonment of both. The first scheme, which was propounded in the shape of a Bill for promoting the elementary education of the people in England and Wales, was introduced by Mr. H. A. Bruce, who had filled the office of Vice-President of the Committee of Council under the Liberal Government, and had for some time devoted much pains to the subject. In the Session of 1867 Mr. Bruce had brought in a Bill similar in many respects to that which he produced in the present Session, except that the former was permissive, the present compulsory in its operation in those cases in which the existence of educational destitution had been established after full inquiry. The machinery was based on the principle of local rating, supplemented as heretofore by grants from the State; and from several recent Acts Mr. Bruce borrowed the principle that the opportunity of voluntary effort should be first given, and that the interference of the State, compelling districts to do their duty, should only follow on the proved neglect of that duty. The Bill provided for the constitution of school districts, which were to be generally conterminous with boroughs or unions, and these districts might by resolution adopt the Act and put it in force. When a school district had been constituted, a school committee was to be appointed, which should be a body corporate, and in it the duty of carrying out the Act was to be vested. For the purpose of enforcing the adoption of the Act in those districts where voluntary effort was deficient, it was proposed that an order for bringing the Act into force in any district might be made by the Committee of Council. An application for such an order might be made by not less than one-tenth of the persons who are or would be electors of the district, and then the Committee of Council, if they had reason to believe that, by reason of the deficiency in any district or place of the means of obtaining elementary education, such an order would be expedient, might appoint a Commissioner in manner directed by the Act with respect to applications for an order of the Committee of Council. This Commissioner was to examine and make a Report on the subject, and this Report was to be published. Should it prove that a school was really required, then the district was allowed three months to adopt the Act; should the inhabitants not avail themselves of this term of grace, the Committee of Council might make an order that the Act should be in force in the district in question, and at the expiration of one month from the date of such order the Act should have the force of law in the district just as if it had been voluntarily adopted. There was in addition a Conscience Clause, to the effect that no scholar should be required when attending the school to learn any catechism or religious formula to which the parent in writing objected, nor to be present at any lesson, instruction, or observance to which such objection had been made.

Mr. Bruce's Bill was brought in and read the first time.

The other Education Bill emanated from the Government, and

was introduced in the House of Lords by the Duke of Marlborough, the President of the Council. His Grace, in reviewing the existing state of elementary education in England, entered into considerable detail as to the provision for instruction already made and the deficiencies which needed to be supplied. He observed that they were not called on to supplant a system, but to survey what had been done already, and to found a national system on what had been hitherto accomplished, having regard to those great denominational principles which characterized the voluntary efforts of those interested in the subject. After quoting statistics to show the proportion of children to population that attended schools, and pointing out that English deficiencies in the matter of education were not so enormous as it had been sought to make out, the Duke went on to refer at length to various returns, not only from Church of England, but from undenominational and Nonconformist sources. He was not in favour of a system of public rating for the maintenance of schools—first, because it would naturally relax the voluntary efforts that were being made, and, next, because under a system of rating a purely secular education would become almost necessary, for which he thought the country was not prepared, any more than it was for a scheme of compulsory rating. After referring to similar topics, and showing the immense extent and importance of the subject, the Duke proceeded to say that it was the intention of the Government to propose that Parliament should empower her Majesty to appoint a Secretary of State to have the whole range of educational matters under his consideration and control. Other clauses would also be incorporated in the Act of Parliament which would enable many Nonconformist schools to avail themselves of the Government aid. They proposed also to embody in the Bill the management clauses which related to inspection of schools of all denominations as they were used by the various religious bodies. The number of schools brought under inspection by that alteration would be very great. An improvement would also be effected with regard to schools in the poorer districts. They did not propose to abandon the system of certificates, but to modify it in such a way as they thought would greatly improve it, and they intended to make some addition to the building grant. After referring to the Conscience Clause, which it was proposed to introduce, and which would lay down the great principle of liberty of teaching, the noble Duke said they did not pretend that this was a complete measure, but the Government believed that they would by it lay a firm foundation for a great national system of education.

Lord Granville thought it would be more convenient to discuss the details of the Bill on its second reading, but at the same time he thanked the Duke of Marlborough for having introduced it in that House. He certainly was not disposed to treat the Bill in a party spirit, but unless great alterations were made in it he thought

The Bill was then discharged.

On the 4th of June the annual vote for the purposes of Education was moved by the Vice-President of the Council, Lord Robert Montagu, in Committee of Supply. The noble lord stated that the whole amount of the vote asked for was 781,324*l.*, 61,230*l.* having been struck off the original estimate when the Government Education Bill was withdrawn. This reduced the increase on last year's estimate to 75,459*l.*, and of this nearly 40,000*l.* was due to the minute of last year relating to pupil teachers, and the remainder to the ordinary increase in the number of aided schools, 11,000*l.* being allowed for the probable effect of the Workshops Act. Lord Robert went with much minuteness into the educational statistics of the year, and among other interesting facts mentioned that the building grants amounted to 30,000*l.*, and for maintenance to 510,679*l.* The grants for normal schools were 73,000*l.*, and the cost of administration and inspection 88,565*l.* The new schools built during the year were seventy-three, the number of schools enlarged sixty, and teachers' residences built forty-eight. 9340 day schools had been visited during the year; there was accommodation for 1,837,307 children, and there were 1,592,912 on the books, of whom 1,342,469 day and 45,837 night scholars were present at inspection; while the average annual attendance was 1,098,742, being an increase for the year of 59,559. There had been 690,532 children—an increase of over 30,000—individually examined, and the increase in the number of passes was 30,532, or sixty-seven per cent. Dwelling at the conclusion of his speech on the great advances made in education during the last few years, Lord Robert stated that the whole number of children at school in Great Britain was 3,091,531; if every child in the country were at school, the number would be 3,424,564—so that only 330,000 were away who ought to be there. Upon the whole he thought that the results showed a satisfactory state of elementary education.

In the discussion which ensued Mr. H. A. Bruce criticized the various items of the vote, and dilated on the advantage and necessity of a rating system. Lord Henley stated his objections to adopting compulsory education in the agricultural districts.

Mr. W. E. Forster referred to a statement put forth by the Birmingham Education Society, with a view of showing that education was by no means in the satisfactory condition the Vice-President of the Council had represented it to be. He also advocated the rating system, but said it was not proposed to defray the whole expense out of the rates, but about one-third, another third being defrayed by the Government, and the remainder by the parents.

The vote was agreed to as proposed, but on the 25th of June Lord R. Montagu's statement underwent a good deal of further criticism on the part of Mr. H. A. Bruce, on the occasion of that gentleman withdrawing his own Bill, of which an account has been already given. Mr. Bruce scrutinized with some strict-

ness the figures and facts adduced by the Vice-President of the Council to support his sanguine estimate of the educational condition of the country, and complained of the contempt with which the Minister had treated the adverse statistics published by the Manchester and Birmingham Educational Aid Societies. But he consoled himself with the remembrance that the Vice-President had treated his official superiors with equal disrespect, for while the Duke of Marlborough in the other House admitted that some considerable measure of improvement was necessary, his Vice-President maintained that the present system, with a very slight development, would suffice for all our needs. In reference to the future prospects of education, Mr. Bruce was of opinion that the religious or denominational difficulty was very slightly felt by the people—except by the Roman Catholics; and, admitting the importance of religious education, he laid it down as a main principle of action, that while the State ought to provide a national and universal system of education, the religious character of it should be left to the locality and to the parents of the children. To the argument of the “pocket”—though he refused to believe that the country would ever refuse its assent to an efficient educational system because of its cost—Mr. Bruce offered the reply that every pound spent in education would be amply repaid by saving in police and prison expenditure. And while he admitted that in the country districts, where the population was sparse, a large assistance from the State might be necessary, he showed by statistics that in the large towns a very minute extension of voluntary efforts would make a rate unnecessary, or at least reduce it to the very smallest proportions.

Mr. Dixon vindicated the accuracy of the statistics from Birmingham, and predicted that the principle of rating would be cordially adopted by the new constituencies.

Mr. Greene and Major Parker thought that if the manufacturers took as much care of their workpeople as the agricultural employers did, the educational deficiencies reported to exist at Birmingham would never have occurred.

Mr. Samuelson thought that Mr. Bruce's Bill was faulty in not going far enough in enforcing education.

Mr. Hubbard admitted that greater educational means were needed, though as yet the statistics before Parliament were not sufficiently ample or trustworthy to justify any correct judgment as to the present educational power of the country. But he denied that those additional means would be secured by Mr. Bruce's Bill. A rating system he held to be totally inapplicable to this country—for there was no agreement sufficiently general as to what education should be to justify a rate. An educational rate in a few years must inevitably share the fate of Church-rates. It would be useless without compulsory attendance, and that, Mr. Hubbard held, could never be put into operation in this country. Though allowing that a Government might be justified in encouraging a purely secular system—if none other could be got

—Mr. Hubbard maintained that such a system must destroy all voluntary effort, and he anticipated the most rapid advances in national education from a judicious and sympathizing encouragement of the voluntary principle.

Lord R. Montagu repeated his assertion that the Birmingham and Manchester statistics were fallacious, and re-affirmed the accuracy of his own figures. He canvassed with some minuteness the provisions of Mr. Bruce's Bill, chiefly with the view of showing that it would largely increase the cost of education, and afforded no security for its quality.

A good deal of desultory discussion on the general subject ensued, in which Mr. Henley objected to the compulsory rating system, which, on the other hand, was upheld by Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. G. Potter, and other-speakers. Ultimately the withdrawal of Mr. Bruce's Bill was agreed to.

The Bill of Mr. J. D. Coleridge for abolishing Religious Tests in the Universities, which in the Session of 1867 had been passed by the House of Commons, but rejected by the House of Lords, was revived in the present Session. The author of this measure had great difficulties to encounter in consequence not only of the determined opposition of the Conservative party, but of the state of public business, which afforded very scanty opportunity for the consideration of any measures except those which were in the hands of the Government, and were necessary to be carried through within the limited duration of the Session. The Bill was indeed fully debated upon the second reading, but it could not be carried, notwithstanding the support of a large majority, beyond that stage. The single discussion which took place upon it was an interesting one. Mr. Coleridge in his speech explained that the present Bill was an amalgamation of those of Mr. Bouverie and Mr. Dodson. It dealt with two separate subjects. It provided that every subject of this realm should be admitted to the full benefits of the Universities without distinction of creed. But it did not interfere with the faculty of Divinity. The second part of the Bill related to the colleges. It did not compel the colleges to do any thing, but it allowed freedom of action, and it removed restrictions. It left the Church of England to stand on her own foundations and on her own inherent force. It had been said that they were endeavouring to appropriate the property of others, but it must be remembered that nine-tenths of the founders were Roman Catholics. He referred to the recent address on this subject to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the answer of his Grace, who said that about ten years ago he was party to a measure which was intended as a settlement of the question. But who was the party on the other side to that settlement? Had the people of England any thing to do with it? The memorial to the Archbishop spoke of the Bill as having the effect of putting a stop to religious teaching in the Universities. When he was at the University the most influential religious teaching they got was derived from the writings and

the example of two illustrious men who were discredited and disavowed by the University authorities—Dr. Arnold and Dr. Newman. Indirect religious teaching might be got from religious services, and in a hundred other ways. This indirect religious teaching was preserved by the Bill. It was enacted that the services of the Church of England should be unaffected by the Bill. Those magnificent endowments of the Universities could not much longer remain the peculium of one religious denomination. At the time of the Reformation they were handed over to the wisest purposes with the best intentions, and if that state of things had remained the colleges ought not to be interfered with. But that state of things had passed away, and with complete religious, political, and social freedom it was reasonable to expect complete educational freedom too.

Mr. Walpole opposed the Bill. He said it was not a question of education, but whether Dissenters should be admitted to govern the Universities. The Church of England was as much entitled to its colleges as Dissenters were entitled to their colleges. He believed the measure would be detrimental to the convictions, the feelings, and the affections of the people of this country, with regard to that combination of religious and secular education which the people of this country had hitherto regarded with so much approval, and which they still desired to continue.

Mr. Winterbotham supported the Bill in a maiden speech of considerable ability. Dissenters, he said, were the creatures of Parliament. The policy of the Act of Uniformity was to make all the people become members of the Church of England, but it had not had that effect. It was not contemplated at that time that it could have the effect of excluding Dissenters from the honours and the prizes of the Universities. One effect had been that the Dissenters had an unlearned clergy. Some of their clergy were learned and distinguished men, but as a rule they were unlearned, which had had a detrimental effect on the middle classes of this country. He believed it would much tend to lessen prejudice and to promote kindly feeling if Dissenters and Churchmen were brought more together. What the Dissenters demanded was perfect religious equality. They asked for nothing more, and would be content with nothing less.

Sir W. Heathcote argued that it was impossible to establish in colleges governing and teaching bodies of different religious doctrines without destroying religious instruction. Rather than secularize the colleges he preferred to make them denominational.

Mr. Hubbard and Mr. Powell followed the same line of argument, predicting the extinction of religious teaching as the consequence of the proposed measure.

Mr. G. Duff, in support of the Bill, asserted that it had in its favour the majority of the working elements of the Universities, and he should be ready to leave the question to the tutors and professors, but that the ultimate result rested in the hands of the country clergy. He encouraged Churchmen to accept the change

predicting that the culture and social influences of the Universities would inevitably convert a considerable proportion of the Nonconformists who were admitted to them. But his chief reason for supporting the Bill was that it would liberate the Universities from ecclesiastical control, and he anticipated its ultimate success from a conviction that the liberal spirit of the age, with its freedom of inquiry, must triumph over the old mediæval semi-monastic ideal of an University.

Mr. Beresford Hope divided the supporters of the Bill into four classes,—the Liberal Churchmen, the honest and single-minded Nonconformists (with both of which he sympathized), the hard and dry secularists (represented by Mr. Lowe), and the free-thinkers, for whom Mr. Duff had just spoken. To the bustling interference of the last school, which had alarmed Churchmen, and would also startle Dissenters when they understood its aims, he attributed the impossibility of hitting upon some compromise which would have remedied the grievances of successful Dissenting undergraduates. There were several modes in which this could be done without breaking in upon the Church of England government of the Universities. Admitting that the Church had hitherto had the monopoly of University education, he justified it by the success of the Universities in producing men of the highest eminence in science, literature, and theology. But referring to recent reforms as a proof that the Universities were anxious to give all reasonable facilities to Dissenters, he appealed earnestly to the House to refrain from legislation for a time, and to leave them to arrive at a satisfactory arrangement for themselves.

Mr. C. Fortescue supported the Bill as a step, but not all that was necessary, towards making the Universities national institutions, and dealt at length with the alleged difficulties in admitting Dissenters, making much of the point that the dogmatic differences between the Church and Dissent are not greater than the discordances between various schools of Churchmen.

Mr. Gathorne Hardy's chief argument against the Bill was that the conjunction in the same governing body of men of different religious opinions with men of no religion at all must lead to confusion and frequent collision, and ultimately to the dropping of religion as an item of education. But to purely secular education Dissenters were as much opposed as Churchmen, and the Bill, therefore, would not fulfil the chief purpose for which it was said to be promoted. Recent self-reforms, he pointed out, would enable Dissenters to take full advantage of the Universities without invading the domestic system of the colleges, and for the reward of deserving Dissenting students he should prefer to draw upon endowments especially founded for the encouragement of learning, than to accept a measure which must result in the secularization of the Universities.

Mr. Bentinck and Mr. Newdegate also earnestly opposed the Bill; Mr. Neate, Mr. Leatham, and other members spoke in its

favour. The House divided on the second reading, which was carried by 198 to 140, but for the reasons already assigned it could not be carried farther.

In the House of Lords an attempt was made by the Earl of Shaftesbury to restrain by legislation those excesses in Ritual observance which a section of the High Church party had lately introduced, and which occasioned much disquiet and contention within the bosom of the Church of England. His lordship, however, in introducing the measure, stated that it was not his intention to carry it beyond the second reading should the House agree to that stage, his object being to have the Bill printed and circulated, with a view to re-introducing it next year. The principal objects aimed at were the prohibition of lights and incense, and of the use of peculiar vestments, mainly in accordance with the report lately made by the Royal Commission on Ritual observances.

The Archbishop of Canterbury said he could not feel justified in supporting the Bill; the Lord Chancellor also objected to it as precipitate and inexpedient. He did not at all object to the course which Lord Shaftesbury had taken, though he thought he had failed to apprehend the spirit of the recommendations made by the Royal Commissioners on Ritualism. He believed better results would follow from postponing legislation on the subject till next year. He deplored the practices to which Lord Shaftesbury had referred, but thought their Lordships ought to be particularly cautious and forbearing in restrictive legislation with regard to them.

The Marquis of Salisbury, in a short but earnest speech, condemned the notion of hasty legislation on this subject. It only required that Parliament should interfere and strike to the ground one of the combatants in the great contest which had existed in the Church for the last 200 years, to add to that side all who sympathized with those against whom Parliament legislated, all those who favoured the weaker side, and all those who hated the particular school from which the legislation emanated. He opposed the second reading of the Bill.

The Bishop of Carlisle as strongly supported it, and declared that there was an honourable obligation on the Government to do the same. After a few words from Lord Stanhope, stating that he should vote against the second reading, in which he was followed by Lord Russell on the ground that the time was inexpedient, Lord Derby rose and moved the "previous question," in order to avoid the inconvenience of a division on a subject which was not ripe for legislation at that period of the Session, nor, at any rate, until after further reports of the Royal Commission had been received.

The "previous question" was accordingly put, and having passed in the negative, the Bill was not further proceeded with.

A measure affecting the Established Church in the West Indies was this year brought in by the Government, which, though of secondary interest in itself, acquired some importance at a time

when the question of discarding a religious establishment was exciting paramount interest in reference to the Protestant Church of Ireland. The object of the Bill was to relieve the Consolidated Fund from the payment of 20,000*l.* a year which had for some time been charged upon it as an endowment of the West Indian Church. The Earl of Carnarvon, in the course of the debate upon the Irish Church, made an effective use of this circumstance, observing that the abolition of the Established Church in Ireland was justified by the arguments upon which the withdrawal of the grant to the Church in the West Indies rested. In short, the circumstances of the Church in the West Indies and in Ireland were parallel, and if any party were chargeable with inconsistency it was her Majesty's Ministers, who, whilst disendowing the Church in the West Indies, resisted its disestablishment in Ireland.

The Lord Chancellor endeavoured to distinguish the two cases, arguing that the grant to the West Indies had been made on account of the distressed state of those settlements, as a temporary succour, and not as a permanent provision.

Lord Carnarvon, however, insisted on the accuracy of his own statement, and repeated, with much particularity, the grounds on which he had described the provision made for the West Indies as a religious endowment. The West Indian bishoprics, he said, had no existence before the year 1824. In that year the Crown, by letters patent, created these bishoprics. In the very next Session Parliament passed the Act about to be repealed, and that Act recited that the Crown had by letters patent constituted these three bishoprics; that the right of appointment was in the Crown; and it then proceeded to assign for the support and sustentation of these bishoprics the sum of 20,000*l.* from the Consolidated Fund; providing, lastly, that if the 4½ per cent. duties in the colony should reach a certain point, that sum of 20,000*l.* should be transferred from the Consolidated Fund to the 4½ per cents. In the following year there was another Act, an amending Act, which simply apportioned part of this 20,000*l.* among some of the minor clergy. From 1826 to 1842 there was no trace of any legislative action on the subject, but in 1842 another Act was passed, enabling the Crown to subdivide these dioceses, and diminish the stipends assigned to the clergy and bishops without any increase of the gross sum of 20,000*l.* Their lordships would see, therefore, that no bishoprics were in existence prior to 1824, that then they were created by patent; that an endowment was made for them; that that endowment remained untouched up to 1842, though power had been given and had been used of redistributing the grant within the sphere and limits of the West India Church, just in the same way as the Lord Chancellor had argued that the funds of the Irish Church ought to be redistributed for the benefit of the Irish Church itself. Therefore, so far as Acts of Parliament were concerned, if this was not the case of an endowment, Lord Carnarvon said he was at a loss to understand what an endowment was.

Earl Granville expressed his opinion that Lord Carnarvon had clearly and fully substantiated his statement. The Marquis of Salisbury admitted that the case of the present Bill would be exactly parallel to the withdrawal of the Maynooth Grant and the *Regium Donum*, but not to the proposed disendowment of the Irish Church, which claimed to hold its property by a title much more solid and independent than was created by a charge on the Consolidated Fund.

The Duke of Buckingham stated that the communications which he had had with those who held the most important sees in the West Indian colonies led him to believe that there would not be any difficulty on the part of the colonists in providing out of their own resources for episcopal supervision on the scale which was usual in our colonial dioceses. It was true that that was not such a provision as was contemplated years ago, when the grant was established, but still it had been found sufficient throughout our colonial possessions. With regard to the houses, lands, and certain allowances appertaining to the bishops, and which had been granted in the colonies, they would, of course, stand just as they did before.

The Bill was passed.

There remains little more to be recorded of the legislative operations of this Session. Several measures were brought in but were either defeated or withdrawn on account of the political circumstances which brought the sittings of Parliament to an early termination. Among the abortive Bills may be noticed that of Mr. J. A. Smith, which had been unsuccessfully proposed in the previous year, for restricting the sale of spirituous liquors on Sundays. This Bill met with a vigorous opposition in the House of Commons, and was referred to a Select Committee, but was not further proceeded with. A measure for that much-desired but long-deferred object, the reform of the law of Bankruptcy was brought in by the Government early in the Session, but did not get beyond its first stage, being abandoned at the end of the Session under pressure of business. A Bill for establishing a Metropolitan Foreign Cattle Market, also proposed by the Ministers, was more vigorously pressed, but encountered an equally vigorous resistance, in which Mr. Milner Gibson and Mr. Ayrton took a leading part, Mr. Gladstone also giving his countenance to the opposition. The result was that the dissentients, having time on their side, prevailed, and the Ministers were compelled, almost on the eve of the prorogation, to drop the Bill, after a good deal of valuable time in the last days of the Session had been expended in discussing it.

Some other measures of public utility, not already noticed, which the Government succeeded in carrying through, may be briefly referred to.

A Bill for the better regulation of the affairs of railway companies, containing some useful provisions for the protection of

shareholders and the advantage of the public. A Bill for carrying to a further extent the excellent policy of several recent statutes for the abrogation of unnecessary oaths. The present measure dealt specially with promissory oaths, and mainly with the oath of allegiance, the terms of which were now reduced to the simplest and most unambiguous form of words. It also substituted declarations in numerous cases for official oaths, and by these alterations mitigated to a great extent what had long been a scandal to our law, the profanation of a sacred ceremony on frequent and frivolous occasions. A Bill for carrying into effect the recommendations of the Public Schools Commissioners, and empowering the alteration of ancient statutory restrictions which interfered with the well-being of these institutions, was, after having undergone much postponement, at length passed into a law before the close of this Session.

Lastly, a measure of no inconsiderable importance was brought in by the Chancellor of the Exchequer for transferring all the electric telegraphs in the kingdom to the State. The nature of this project was explained by the right honourable gentleman in moving the second reading of the Bill. He stated that it authorized the Government to treat with the telegraph companies for the purchase of their undertakings, and further empowered the Postmaster-General to work the lines so purchased. The public had shown considerable interest in the measure, and seventy-seven petitions had been already presented in its favour from chambers of commerce, public bodies, and traders in various portions of the empire. A great number of petitions had also been presented from newspaper proprietors. On the other hand, but ten adverse petitions had been presented by telegraph and railway companies, although a number of individual shareholders in those undertakings had petitioned against it. The Government had endeavoured to meet the telegraph companies in a spirit of fairness. Those companies had proposed to sell their interest at twenty-five years' purchase, with an understanding that compensation should be given to their officers. The Government had not assented to that offer, but they proposed that the basis of the purchase should be the highest price realized on the Stock Exchange prior to the 25th of May; that compensation should be given to such of the officers as were not provided for in the Post Office, provided such officers had received a yearly salary and had served not less than five years. The companies had not agreed to this. The opposition of the railway companies arose from an impression that they would not obtain the same facilities from Government which they now received from private companies, but that assumption was ill founded. He proposed to introduce a money Bill by which to raise the necessary funds, and he estimated a surplus revenue of 210,000*l.* a year from the working of the system. This would pay off the capital in twenty-nine years at three and a half per cent. The capital to be raised would be

between three and four millions, and Government would avail themselves as far as possible of the savings-banks' funds.

Considerable opposition to this project was manifested at the outset, and several members, particularly among those connected with the management of railways, resisted the proposition. Mr. Leeman moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. Mr. Gladstone, though he avowed his prepossession to be in favour of the scheme, thought that further information was necessary before the House of Commons could legislate upon it, and supported the motion for inquiry, which was ultimately agreed to. The Bill consequently underwent a searching investigation in Committee, the result of which was afterwards stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He said there had been antagonism with the telegraph companies, and also with the railway companies, but an agreement was come to with the telegraph companies that they were to get twenty years' purchase of their net profits. As to the railways, the Scotch companies were the first to accept the terms of Government, which were in principle similar to those offered to the telegraph companies, it being provided that there should be a severance of the wires, so that the companies should have the free use of their own wires to regulate their own traffic. As to the financial question, Mr. Scudamore's estimate was that four millions would cover the whole. But as the negotiation proceeded Reuter's system had been included, and other valuable properties had been acquired, which would raise the estimate to six millions as an outside figure. But even at this large sum the Government believed they had made a good bargain, as the estimated revenue would be sufficient to pay $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon a sum of eight millions, whereas six millions only could possibly be required. On the whole, looking to the nature of the property to be acquired, to the circumstance that the earnings of the companies to be absorbed were increasing at the rate of 10 per cent. per annum, and to the enormous development of the system which might be anticipated from low rates, uniformity of management, and extension of facilities, the Government were of opinion that they had concluded a safe and profitable transaction.

The terms proposed to be paid to the companies for compensation were considered by several members, among others by Mr. Goschen (who had served on the Select Committee) and by Mr. Gladstone to be unfavourable to the public, but the Bill was passed. The power of giving effect to the financial part of the scheme, by sanctioning the requisite appropriation of public money, was however reserved to the next Parliament.

At length, on the 31st of July, all the business which was absolutely required to be despatched before the impending dissolution was brought to a close, and the last day of the active existence of the House of Commons arrived. The Royal Assent was given by Commission to a long list of Bills, and in the

presence of a very small number of members of either House the Lord Chancellor read from the throne the following royal message :—

“ My Lords and Gentlemen :

“ I am happy to be enabled to release you from your labours, and to offer you my acknowledgments for the diligence with which you have applied yourselves to your parliamentary duties.

“ My relations with foreign powers remain friendly and satisfactory. I have no reason to apprehend that Europe will be exposed to the calamity of war ; and my policy will continue to be directed to secure the blessings of peace.

“ I announced to you at the beginning of the Session that I had directed an expedition to be sent to Abyssinia to liberate my Envoy, and others of my subjects, detained by the ruler of that country in an unjust captivity.

“ I feel sure that you will share in my satisfaction at the complete success which has attended that expedition. After a march of 400 miles, through a difficult and unexplored country, my troops took the strong place of Magdala, freed the captives, and vindicated the honour of my Crown, and, by their immediate return, without one act of oppression or needless violence, proved that the expedition had been undertaken only in obedience to the claims of humanity, and in fulfilment of the highest duties of my sovereignty.

“ The cessation of the long-continued efforts to promote rebellion in Ireland has for some time rendered unnecessary the exercise by the Executive of exceptional powers. I rejoice to learn that no person is now detained under the provisions of the Act for the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus, and that no prisoner awaits trial in Ireland for an offence connected with the Fenian conspiracy.

“ Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

“ I have to thank you for the liberal supplies which you have voted for the public service.

“ My Lords and Gentlemen :

“ I have had much satisfaction in giving my assent to a series of measures completing the great work of the amendment of the representation of the people in Parliament, which has engaged your attention for two Sessions.

“ I have seen with satisfaction that the time necessarily occupied by this comprehensive subject has not prevented your dealing with other questions of great public interest, and I have gladly given my sanction to Bills for the better government of public schools, the regulation of railways, the amendment of the law relating to British sea fisheries, and for the acquisition and main-

tenance of electric telegraphs by the Postmaster-General, and to several important measures having for their object the improvement of the law, and of the civil and criminal procedures in Scotland.

"By the appointment of a Comptroller-in-Chief in the War Office a considerable reform in army administration has been commenced, which, by combining at home and abroad the various departments of military supply under one authority, will conduce to greater economy and efficiency both in peace and war.

"It is my intention to dissolve the present Parliament at the earliest day that will enable my people to reap the benefit of the extended system of representation which the wisdom of Parliament has provided for them. I look with entire confidence to their proving themselves worthy of the high privilege with which they have thus been invested; and I trust that, under the blessing of Divine Providence, the expression of their opinion on those great questions of public policy which have occupied the attention of Parliament and remain undecided may tend to maintain unimpaired that civil and religious freedom which has been secured to all my subjects by the institutions and settlement of my realm."

Parliament was then prorogued until October 8, it being understood that its dissolution would take place soon after that date.

Considering that the Session was rather prematurely closed, and that a large portion of it was consumed in a lengthened contention between the two great parties on an absorbing question of imperial policy, it would appear rather a matter of surprise that so much was done in the way of legislation, than that a larger amount was not accomplished.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.—Parliament is dissolved by Proclamation on November 11, and a new one summoned to meet on December 10. Writs issued and elections rapidly proceeded with.—Results of the contest on the relative strength of the two parties—Large gains of the Liberals in the English boroughs, and in Scotland and Ireland—The Conservatives are successful in many of the English counties—A considerable addition is made on the whole to the Liberal majority—Remarkable defeat of Mr. Gladstone in South West Lancashire, and of many of the leading Liberals in other places—Mr. Gladstone is provided with another seat at Greenwich—Operation of the "Minority Clause" in London, Glasgow, Birmingham, and other large constituencies—Results of the contests in the Metropolitan and suburban constituencies, the Universities of Oxford and of London, and other important places—Aggregate numbers of votes polled on each side in the three kingdoms—*Resignation of the Conservative Government at the conclusion of the Elections*—Letter of Mr. Disraeli to his supporters in the two Houses in explanation of this step—The course pursued by the late Premier is generally approved of—Mr. Gladstone is commanded by the Queen to form an administration—Composition of the new Cabinet, and subsidiary

appointments—Accession of Mr. Bright to office, and his appointment as a Privy Councillor—Meeting of the new Parliament on December 10—It is opened by commission—Mr. J. E. Denison, the late Speaker, is re-elected—Swearing-in of Members and issue of new writs—The Ministers vacating their seats are re-elected without opposition—The Premier is returned again for Greenwich—His speech on re-election—Mr. Bright states to the electors of Birmingham his reasons for accepting office—The House of Commons meets again on December 29, when the Ministers re-elected take their seats and further new writs are issued—Parliament adjourned to February 16—RETROSPECT OF THE EVENTS OF THE YEAR—Domestic occurrences—The Abyssinian expedition—The general election and change of Ministry—Cessation of Fenian outbreaks—Gradual but slow recovery of trade from the crisis of 1866—Low value of money and uniformity in the rate of interest—Results of commercial transactions—Imports and exports compared with those of 1867—Progress of Railways and Telegraphs—Further discoveries of the precious metals—Natural phenomena—Unusual heat and drought of the summer—Violent storms and inundations in the autumn—Remarkable prevalence of earthquakes in various parts of the world—Accidents and disasters from Railways and other causes—Losses sustained by the public from deaths of eminent persons—Conclusion.

It being understood between the Ministerial party and their opponents that the new Parliament to be elected under the Reform Act should be enabled to meet in sufficient time before Christmas to allow its decision to be taken upon the fate of Mr. Disraeli's Administration, according to the opinion which the nation might pronounce upon the question of the Irish Church, the legislative arrangements necessary for that purpose had been satisfactorily made before the prorogation. By the Registration of Voters' Act, carried in the expiring Parliament, the various steps necessary for completing the Registers for the year had been so far accelerated as to enable the dissolution to take place by the middle of November, and to leave time for the general election to be accomplished by the second week in December. The means adopted for this end produced the desired result. The interval between the prorogation of the old Parliament and the time fixed for electing the new was earnestly employed by the candidates for seats throughout the three kingdoms in prosecuting their canvass. The great increase in the numbers of the electors introduced by the late Reform Act made the labour of the aspirants, especially in the large constituencies, unusually onerous. The toil undergone in the prosecution of this object throughout an exceptionally hot summer and autumn was very considerable; nor was the expenditure of money disproportionate to the time employed. Many indeed were deterred from engaging in contests which could not be carried on except at a heavy cost, and there were not a few constituencies to which none but men of considerable wealth could venture to present themselves. The money furnished by such candidates flowed freely for many weeks preceding the elections, and it is to be feared that the corruption, drunkenness, and demoralization which are the invariable accompaniments of a general appeal to the electoral body were not less prominent features of the present than of former contests.

On the 11th of November, the registrations having been fully completed, a royal proclamation appeared in the "Gazette," by

which the dissolution of the existing Parliament was pronounced and a new one summoned to meet on the 10th of December. The writs were immediately issued, and before the end of the ensuing week nearly all the borough and a large number of the county elections had been completed. The results in some respect falsified the expectations of all parties. In the English boroughs, with certain exceptions, the Liberal party achieved a decided success, and largely increased their majority. In the English counties, alike in those in which manufacturing and those where agricultural interests predominated, the Conservatives obtained many signal triumphs. In Scotland, again, the candidates of the latter party suffered extraordinary reverses; in the boroughs they could do nothing, and even in those counties where they had the influence of the wealthiest landowners in their favour strangers who came forward under Liberal colours wrested the victory from resident and familiar candidates on the unpopular side. Of the whole number of representatives returned by Scotland seven only were Conservatives. In Ireland also the Liberal party gained a decided, though not so overwhelming an advantage. Some of the boroughs in the province of Ulster in which the Presbyterian influence prevails were for the first time won by Liberals.

The aggregate result of the elections produced an important accession to the strength of that party which acknowledged Mr. Gladstone as leader, and adhered to his project of disestablishing the Irish Church. According to the best computation it would appear that the Liberals gained in the whole fifteen seats, which is equivalent to thirty votes on a division. The relative strength of the two parties in the new Parliament was estimated as follows:—Liberals 387, Conservatives 272. But though the net result was thus favourable to the former party, their triumph was somewhat marred by considerable local defeats, and by the rejection of some of the most eminent members of the Liberal ranks, especially by that of Mr. Gladstone himself. Despising the easy success which he might have obtained with a smaller constituency, that gentleman had fearlessly appealed to the great electoral division of South-West Lancashire, and had in several powerful speeches addressed to large multitudes of the constituents endeavoured to gain their support to the cause on which he had staked the issue. On the other hand great and weighty influences both of property and of opinion were efficiently worked against him, the efforts of the clergy being especially active in the defence of what they considered the sacred cause of the Irish Church. The election, which was attended with much excitement and was watched with extraordinary interest throughout the kingdom, terminated as follows:—

For Mr. Cross, Conservative . . .	7729
Mr. Turner, Conservative . . .	7676
Mr. Gladstone, Liberal . . .	7415
Mr. Grenfell, Liberal . . .	6939

Mr. Gladstone issued the following address to the electors as soon as the result was known:—

“To the electors of South-West Lancashire.—Gentlemen, I return my most cordial thanks to the 7415 electors who supported me at the poll, and to the numerous and zealous friends who have so ably acted on my behalf. It is to me a matter of lively satisfaction, which I can never lose, that I received a large majority of votes within the district of Liverpool. I have the honour to be, &c. W. E. GLADSTONE.”

It was fortunate for Mr. Gladstone that the contingency of his defeat, not wholly unanticipated, had been provided for by the zeal of his friends in another numerous constituency. His return for the borough of Greenwich in conjunction with another Liberal member, Alderman Salomons, had been previously secured; so that in any event the leader of the Opposition was certain of a seat.

Nor was the rejection of Mr. Gladstone the only success which the Conservatives achieved in the great county of Lancaster, hitherto supposed to be the stronghold of Liberal principles. In the northern division the Marquis of Hartington, a member of Earl Russell's Cabinet, was displaced by a large majority from the seat he had previously held, the poll being headed by a son of Lord Derby. For the north-eastern and south-eastern divisions the returns were all Conservative. Manchester, of which more will be said hereafter, returned one of the latter party, Salford, Preston, Blackburn, and Bolton, two each; Ashton, Clitheroe, and Staleybridge, one each; in the whole, twenty-one Conservatives against eleven Liberals for the county and boroughs.

Considerable interest was felt during this election in the operation of the new principle of voting, commonly known as the “Minority Clause,” by which, under the provisions of the late Reform Act, cumulative votes were for the first time authorized in those counties which returned three members each, as well as in certain large cities and towns, viz. London, Glasgow, Manchester, Liverpool, and Leeds. In the counties the operation of the clause in question was simply to transfer one of the three seats (in most cases without a contest) to a representative of the minority of the electors, excluding one of the trio who had previously sat on the dominant side. Such was the result in Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Bucks, and Herts. But in the great towns the consequences of the new principle were more various. In Glasgow, so great was the preponderance of Liberal opinions, that three members of that party were placed at the head of the poll, excluding the candidates of the minority altogether. In Birmingham the result was just the same. In Manchester, out of three returned two were Liberal, but one Conservative, the latter being first upon the poll. At Liverpool, where the previous representation had been Conservative, two of that party were elected together with

one Liberal, who came in third. At Leeds two Liberals headed the poll, a Conservative occupying the third place. In the City of London the contest excited great interest. The four old members, all of Liberal politics, were opposed by three Conservatives. Three of the former were chosen, but the remaining one, Baron Lionel Rothschild, suffered defeat, the fourth seat being gained by Mr. Bell, one of the Tory candidates¹.

The metropolitan constituencies in every case except that last mentioned, and another signal exception, that of Westminster, sent none but Liberal representatives to the new Parliament. In Westminster, Mr. John Stuart Mill was defeated by a candidate of considerable wealth and commercial reputation, Mr. William Smith, who had stood without success at the general election of 1865, but was now returned by a large majority at the head of the poll. It should be observed that the eminent writer and economist whom he displaced had alienated many of his former supporters by certain injudicious acts which damaged his reputation as a practical politician. In the metropolitan county another signal victory was gained by the Conservatives in the person of Lord G. Hamilton who headed the Middlesex poll by a large majority, and the suburban county constituencies of Surrey and Kent returned politicians of the same complexion, with the exception of two Liberals elected for East Surrey. The University of Oxford manifested its usual tenacity of Conservative opinions. One of the seats becoming open by the retirement of Sir William Heathcote, Sir Roundell Palmer accepted an invitation numerous and influentially signed to stand for the vacancy. It was generally acknowledged that no man could present higher claims in respect of character or attainments to this honour than the late Attorney-General of the Liberal Government, but the fact of that political connexion outweighed, in the opinion of a large portion of the constituency, all personal merits. A Conservative holding the office of Advocate-General under the existing Government, Mr. Mowbray, was put forward by those who distrusted the Liberal leanings of Sir R. Palmer; and so strong was the demonstration of opposition to the latter, that his friends judged it prudent to withdraw his name before the election came on, and the borough of Richmond again afforded this eminent lawyer his seat in the House. The newly-enfranchised University of London selected out of a list of distinguished candidates the Right Honourable Robert Lowe, who was returned without a contest as the first representative of that body.

The present election was signalized by the exclusion of several of the best known and most prominent members of former Parliaments. Among those who failed to obtain seats were the familiar

¹ This gentleman having died early in the ensuing year the seat reverted without a contest to Baron Rothschild, the benefit of the Minority Clause being lost in a single election.

names of Roebuck, Milner Gibson, Austin Bruce², Bernal Osborne, Lord Hartington³, Frederick Peel, Lord Amberley, S. Laing, and Mr. Horsman. The penalty of exclusion which thus far fell most heavily on the Liberal side of the House, was felt also in a peculiar degree by the lawyers of the Conservative party. Among those who were thus rejected were Sir John Karslake and Sir R. Bag-gallay, the Attorney and Solicitor-General, together with Mr. Garth, Q.C., Mr. E. Karslake, Q.C., Mr. Huddleston, Q.C., and the Lord-Advocate for Scotland.

The contests throughout the general election of 1868 were more numerous than at any general election for many years. The total number of votes polled in the United Kingdom was 2,291,769.

Distinguishing the three kingdoms, the following table shows the total number of votes recorded on each side, with the Liberal balance:—

	Liberal Vote.	Conservative Vote.	Liberal Majority.
England and Wales	1,231,450	824,057	407,393
Scotland . . .	123,410	23,391	100,019
Ireland . . .	53,379	36,082	17,297
	<hr/> 1,408,239	<hr/> 883,530	<hr/> 524,709

Two hundred and twenty-seven persons who had no seats in the House of Commons at its dissolution were returned to the new Parliament. So great an amount of change had not taken place at any election since the Reform Act of 1832.

While the public mind was engaged with the results of the late elections, and calculating their effect upon the position of parties, it was surprised by a sudden resolve of the Prime Minister which set aside all prognostications. Mr. Disraeli, having convinced himself that the decision of the constituencies was such as to preclude all prospect of the Conservative party remaining in power, at once placed his own resignation and that of his Cabinet in the hands of her Majesty. The resolution taken and the reasons for adopting it were communicated to the supporters of the Government in both Houses on the 2nd of December by a circular in the following terms:—

“If Parliament were sitting I should not have adopted this course; but as the public acts of a Ministry should not be misunderstood, and as there are no other means of explaining their motives, I have taken the liberty of thus addressing the Conservative members in both Houses of Parliament.

“When her Majesty’s Government, in the spring of this year, were placed in a minority in the House of Commons on the question of disestablishing the Church in Ireland, they had to consider that the policy proposed had never been submitted to the country, and they believed that the country would not sanction it.

² In consequence of a vacancy occasioned by death Mr. Bruce was shortly afterwards returned to Parliament for the county of Renfrew, and Lord Hartington became representative of the Radnorshire boroughs on an opening made by the retirement of the former member.

"They therefore felt it their duty to advise her Majesty to dissolve Parliament; but to make an appeal to the obsolete constituency would have been an absurdity, and the candid opinion of the country coincided with that of Parliament, that no course could be satisfactory unless the voices of the enlarged electoral body were ascertained. All means were therefore taken by the Ministry to expedite that appeal, and a special statute was passed for the purpose.

"Although the general election has elicited, in the decision of numerous and vast constituencies, an expression of feeling which, in a remarkable degree, has justified their anticipations, and which, in dealing with the question in controversy, no wise statesman would disregard, it is now clear that the present Administration cannot expect to command the confidence of the newly-elected House of Commons.

"Under these circumstances, her Majesty's Ministers have felt it due to their own honour, and to the policy they support, not to retain office unnecessarily for a single day. They hold it to be more consistent with the attitude they have assumed, and with the convenience of public business at this season, as well as more conducive to the just influence of the Conservative party, at once to tender the resignation of their offices to her Majesty, rather than to wait for the assembling of a Parliament in which, in the present aspect of affairs, they are sensible that they must be in a minority.

"In thus acting, her Majesty's Government have seen no cause to modify those opinions upon which they deemed it their duty to found their counsel to the Sovereign on the question of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church. They remain convinced that the proposition of Mr. Gladstone is wrong in principle, probably impracticable in conduct, and, if practicable, would be disastrous in its effects.

"While ready at all times to give a fair consideration and willing aid to any plan for the improvement of the Church in Ireland, to the policy which they opposed last Session, rife, as they believe it to be, with many calamities to society and the State, they will continue, in whatever position they occupy, to offer an uncompromising resistance.

B. DISRAELI.

"Downing-street, December 2, 1868."

A great sensation was at first excited in the public mind by an announcement which took the nation unawares, and anticipated, it was at first thought somewhat hastily, the verdict of the recently-elected Parliament. The only precedent that could be remembered for such a course was that of the Earl of Ripon in 1828, whose Cabinet, formed on the death of Mr. Canning, but collapsing from internal weakness and dissensions, did not survive to meet Parliament. The circumstances of the two cases were, however, quite dissimilar. Upon reflection it was generally thought that Mr. Disraeli and his colleagues had acted with good judgment in declining a Parliamentary contest of which there could be no doubt as to the immediate issue. Pledged as a large

majority of the new House was to support Mr. Gladstone on the cardinal question of the Irish Church, it would have been a futile course to embark in a formal debate to be certainly followed by a decisive defeat of Ministers, a result which would probably have imparted additional solidity and confidence to the adverse majority. The Government would have also been placed in a position of much difficulty in having to frame a speech for the Sovereign, from which it would have been impossible to omit the subject of the Irish Church, but difficult on the other hand to mention it without committing themselves more or less to some form of action upon it, the true policy of the defenders of that institution being simply one of resistance to aggression. It was further considered that the timely retreat of the Conservative Cabinet was conducive to the advantage of the public service, as deciding at the earliest moment the question which party was to be in power, and affording time for those who were to conduct the business of the country in the ensuing year to mature their plans and prepare their measures, without needing to postpone the usual opening of the Session. Upon the whole, therefore, Mr. Disraeli was admitted to have decided wisely both for his party and for the public convenience in forestalling the verdict which the new House of Commons was certain to pronounce upon his Administration.

As to the choice of his successor there could under the circumstances be no question. Mr. Gladstone had been the leader in whose name the Liberal party had gained the suffrages of the constituencies, and he was the natural and necessary successor to the official supremacy. In obedience to a summons from her Majesty the right honourable gentleman on the 5th of December went to Windsor Castle and received the royal commands to form an Administration. Notwithstanding the proverbial difficulties of this task, and the special perplexity anticipated on this occasion from the number of conflicting claims, the arrangements were made with more than usual celerity, and within a few days it was announced that the Cabinet had been composed as follows:—

First Lord of the Treasury, Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone.
 Lord Chancellor, Lord Hatherley (late Sir W. Page Wood).
 Lord President of the Council, Lord de Grey and Ripon.
 Lord Privy Seal, Earl of Kimberley.
 Chancellor of the Exchequer, Right Hon. R. Lowe.
 Secretary for the Home Department, Right Hon. H. A. Bruce.
 Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Earl of Clarendon.
 Secretary for the Colonies, Earl Granville.
 Secretary of War, Right Hon E. Cardwell.
 Secretary for India, Duke of Argyll.
 Secretary for Ireland, Right Hon. Chichester Fortescue.
 First Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. C. E. Childers.
 President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Bright.
 Postmaster-General, Lord Hartington.

Poor Law Board, Right Hon. G. J. Goschen.

The Ministers and great Officers of State not in the Cabinet were the following :—

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Lord Dufferin.

Lord Steward, the Earl of Bessborough.

Lord Chamberlain, Viscount Sydney.

Master of the Horse, the Marquis of Ailesbury.

Mistress of the Robes, Duchess of Argyll.

Master of the Buckhounds, the Earl of Cork.

Chief Commissioner of Works and Buildings, Mr. Layard.

Joint Secretaries of the Treasury, Mr. George Glyn, Mr. Ayrton.

Lords of the Treasury, Mr. Adam, Captain Vivian.

Third Lord of the Treasury, Mr. Stansfeld.

Junior Lords of the Admiralty, Vice-Admiral Sir S. C. Dacres,

Vice-Admiral Sir R. S. Robinson, Captain Lord John Hay,

Mr. G. O. Trevelyan.

Secretary to the Admiralty, Mr. Baxter.

Secretary to the Board of Trade, Mr. G. Shaw-Lefevre.

Secretary to the Poor Law Board, Mr. A. W. Peel.

Under Secretaries : Home Department, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen ; India, Mr. Grant Duff ; Foreign Affairs, Mr. Otway ; Colonies, Right Hon. W. Monsell ; War, Lord Northbrook.

Attorney-General, Sir Robert Collier.

Solicitor-General, Mr. Coleridge.

Lord-Advocate for Scotland, Mr. Moncreiff.

Solicitor-General for Scotland, Mr. G. Young.

Ireland ; Lord-Lieutenant, Earl Spencer ; Lord Chancellor, Mr.

Justice O'Hagan ; Attorney-General, Mr. E. Sullivan ; Solicitor-General, Mr. Serjeant Barry.

The composition of the new Administration was generally considered to be strong, and the distribution of offices judicious. The Cabinet, it will be observed, contained a combination of two elements, introduced in tolerably equal proportions. On the one hand the leading Whig families, long habituated to official life, were adequately represented, on the other hand the more pronounced Liberal members gave a popular complexion to the Ministry. The promotion which attracted the most comment and speculation, though not surprise to those who had watched the progress of events, was that of Mr. Bright to the Presidency of the Board of Trade. It was made no secret that the accession of this powerful orator to the Cabinet had been pressed upon him by the head of the Government, but for a time earnestly resisted. He consented, after much persuasion, to accept the Presidency of the Board of Trade, declining, however, as was understood, a still higher Cabinet office which was proposed to him. Mr. Bright was soon afterwards made a member of the Privy Council, and was honoured by the Sovereign with a very gracious reception.

Earl Russell, whose long services had earned repose, declined to be included in the Ministerial arrangements. Sir George Grey also preferred to give the Government an independent support. Sir Roundell Palmer, whose claims to legal promotion were of the highest order, was prevented by scruples which he entertained on the Irish Church question, from becoming at the present time a member of a Government with whose general policy he concurred.

The new Parliament met on the day for which it had been summoned, December 10th. The Ministerial benches were necessarily unoccupied, the Prime Minister and his colleagues having vacated their seats upon acceptance of office. Her Majesty being unable to appear in person, the opening of the Session was performed by Commission. It was understood that no proceedings could take place at the present time, except the choosing of a Speaker by the House of Commons, and the taking of the Parliamentary oaths by members.

The Usher of the Black Rod having summoned the House of Commons to attend at the Bar of the House of Lords, and the letters patent authorizing the Commissioners to open Parliament having been read,

The Lord Chancellor said, "My Lords and Gentlemen—We have it in command of her Majesty to let you know that, as soon as the members of both Houses shall be sworn in, the causes of her Majesty's calling this Parliament shall be declared to you; and it being necessary that a Speaker of the House of Commons be first chosen, it is her Majesty's pleasure that you, gentlemen of the House of Commons, repair to the place where you are to sit, and there proceed to choose some proper person to be your Speaker, and present such person whom you shall so choose here to-morrow, at two o'clock, for her Majesty's royal approbation."

The Commons then retired to their own House, after which Sir George Grey rose, and addressing the Chief Clerk at the Table said, "Sir Denis Le Marchant—In compliance with the communication which has just been addressed to us by the Crown, it is our duty now to proceed without delay to the election of a Speaker. I have great satisfaction in proposing that my right hon. friend the member for North Nottinghamshire, Mr. John Evelyn Denison, shall be chosen to fill that honourable and important office. I have the greater satisfaction in submitting this proposal to the House because I have every reason to believe that it is one which will be met by unanimous concurrence. Twelve years, or nearly twelve years, have passed since, on a vacancy in the office of Speaker, Mr. Denison's long experience as a private member of this House, his high character, his sedulous attention to the business of the House, and specially to that important branch of the business relating to private legislation, and his intimate acquaintance with the rules and forms of the House, pointed him out as a fit successor to one who had long filled the chair of this House with eminent ability—I mean the present Viscount Eversley. In two subsequent Par-

liaments the House of Commons has ratified the choice of a Speaker made first in 1857, and has thereby afforded a gratifying and well-merited proof of its approval of the conduct of Mr. Denison in the chair, and its confidence in the judgment and impartiality with which he has discharged the duties, laborious and often very delicate, which attach to the office of Speaker. Mr. Denison's parliamentary life I believe now extends over a period of more than forty years, during nearly twelve of which he has occupied the chair of this House. We all rejoice to know that he still retains that physical and mental vigour which are necessary for the duties of the post." The right hon. baronet concluded by moving that the Right Hon. John Evelyn Denison do take the chair of this House.

Mr. Walpole said, "At the request of gentlemen on both sides of the House, and of those who have naturally and properly the greatest influence in it, I rise with great pleasure to second the motion which my right honourable friend the member for Morpeth has so judiciously and ably submitted to our consideration. I mention that I do this with the concurrence of those who have justly and properly the highest influence in the House, because it will show that my right honourable friend the member for Morpeth is not wrong in his anticipation that the proposal made by him will be unanimously accepted on every side of this House."

Mr. Denison said that whatever of health and strength was now granted to him, he freely dedicated to the service of the House, and he now submitted himself to its pleasure. The right honourable gentleman was then conducted to the chair by his mover and seconder.

The Speaker then said he was about to ask a favour of the House, but he felt by the manner of the proceedings of the day that it was already granted. He was about to ask for the continuance of the general support and confidence which had been afforded to him on former occasions. "The late House of Commons," said the right honourable gentleman, "was considered not adequately to represent the great body of the people. This House has been elected on the basis of household suffrage, and by that it has been endowed with a considerable increase of power. Whatever measures, after due deliberation, may be considered for the public good, the House will deal with them boldly and firmly, but neither will it forget that the great grace and ornament of strength is moderation in its exercise, asserting itself, but respecting the rights of others. The House has always in its own proceedings dealt in this spirit. It has afforded protection to minorities, and given full freedom of speech and ample latitude for debate. No doubt it will not depart from that course. I hope and firmly believe that this House will prove itself worthy of its great privileges, and that it will be found second to none of those that have preceded it in those qualities which have made the name of the House of Commons famous as the great palladium and

bulwark of order and of law. I once more make my grateful and respectful acknowledgments to the House."

The Lord Advocate, Mr. Moncreiff, being the senior Minister present, and who had by the somewhat singular circumstance of receiving his appointment prior to the termination of his election, escaped the consequence of being obliged to vacate his seat, congratulated the Speaker on his elevation, and expressed his confident belief that the occupant of the chair would be supported in the discharge of his duties by the same personal respect and loyal deference to his authority which had been accorded to him by former Parliaments. On the following day, the Speaker having taken the chair, the House was again summoned to attend in the House of Lords. The Speaker, accompanied by a large number of members, immediately repaired thither, and on his return reported that her Majesty, by her Royal Commissioners, had been pleased to express her approval of the choice the House had made of himself as Speaker. The right honourable gentleman added that he had then, on behalf of the Commons, laid claim to all their ancient rights and privileges, including freedom of debate, freedom from arrest of their persons for debt, free access to her Majesty whenever occasion demanded, and the most favourable construction upon all their proceedings. All these her Majesty, by her Royal Commissioners, was, he said, pleased to allow and confirm.

The Speaker then took the oath and subscribed the parliamentary roll.

The next two days were employed in administering the oaths to members, and on the 15th of December an adjournment of the House of Commons to the 29th took place, in order to enable the Ministers who should in the meantime have been re-elected to take their seats, and new writs to be moved in the case of other members accepting office.

No opposition was any where made to the re-elections. Mr. Gladstone issued his address to the electors of Greenwich, and on the 22nd of December made his appearance on the hustings. The nomination of the Prime Minister was moved by Mr. Angerstein and seconded by Mr. Jolly. No other candidate appearing, he was declared duly elected. Mr. Gladstone, who was received with great cordiality, returned thanks for the confidence now again reposed in him by the electors, and after commenting on the results of the late appeal to the country made by the late Government, said: "By that appeal you were asked a question that every body understood, and I believe that every body understands the reply. At any rate, the late Ministers perfectly understood it. The late Ministers said that the sentiments uttered in the House of Commons last Session respecting Ireland did not represent the sentiments of the national mind, and that the verdict given last Session would be signally reversed on an appeal to the country. But the result of that election, instead of converting the majority into a minority, has rendered the majority greater than it had been before."

The right honourable gentleman then said they had now attained to a stage of advancement in regard to parliamentary suffrage which formed an epoch in the history of the country. Many imperfections and anomalies might be pointed to in the recent Act which will require a careful review, but such review was not the issue of the hour, as every practical man must address himself to subjects of public interest in the order which their importance, even in point of time, might prescribe. There were, however, two subjects which could not be overlooked in connexion with the representation of the people. The securities afforded for perfect freedom in giving a vote would require attention. Upon that subject he would say that in some portions of the country, and most of all perhaps in Blackburn, there had been transactions which should form, through the hands of some independent member, the subject of searching inquiry. He had always given his vote in favour of the method of open voting, and did so now with this important reservation, that whether there is open voting, or whatever be the means, free voting must be secured. Another question of urgency was the position of grievance in which compound householders had been placed by being compelled practically to alter the tenure of their dwellings, as a condition of exercising their votes, votes given to them not as a personal favour, but as a public trust and duty. These grievances had been wantonly inflicted, and it would be the duty of a Liberal Government forthwith to set about the means of discovering, in the best and most inoffensive form, a remedy for these pressing evils. There were other great questions much in arrear. There was the question of bankruptcy, in which the commercial community was deeply interested, and the question of education, great in all its branches; great in the highest branch, which touches the Universities; great in the intermediate branch, which embraces the grammar schools of the middle classes; greater of all in the primary branch, which concerns the mass of the people; with these questions were more or less connected the discussions on the relations between capital and labour. He would now come to the question of public expenditure. He was responsible for having taken the earliest possible opportunity to direct the public mind to that subject. There were times when the public mind became comparatively relaxed as to the general principles of economy and thrift, and it was the special duty of a public man to watch the very beginnings of evil in that department. It was very easy to notice evils when they became gigantic, but it commonly happened that when financial error attained such dimensions, the case had become too aggravated for a remedy. He rejoiced to think that during the recent elections the attention of the country had been effectually directed to economy and retrenchment. He knew of no reason why three millions should have been recently added to our public expenditure. It was one thing to put on three millions; it was another thing to take them off. By putting on three millions they created a number of new relations,

a number of offices, a number of new claims, and of new expectations, and they could not, and they ought not, to destroy all these in a moment. Therefore the work of retrenchment must be gradual. But he and his colleagues had even before this early moment directed their attention to this subject. And now as to the absorbing question—the state of Ireland, which had constituted the main issue during the recent elections. It was on that question that they heard the greatest amount, he would not say of Pharisaical, but at any rate of womanish lamentation, and in a parenthesis he would observe that (although they had a few ladies present) the word womanish was totally different from womanly, for those lamentations were not womanly at all. They had heard a lamentation that the state of Ireland had been made a party question. A more idle complaint could not be made. The state of Ireland had made itself felt by every party, and Lord Stanley, at the Conservative banquet in January last, had declared with truth and manliness that the question of Ireland was the question of the day. The Government of Lord Derby stated that they would shortly explain to Parliament their policy for Ireland. What did that mean? We have not a policy for every part of the kingdom. It was not necessary for him to say that he had a policy for Scotland. Scotland did not want a policy. Ireland did and does, and Lord Derby promised a policy, and Mr. Disraeli and Lord Mayo announced that policy to be to maintain Maynooth and the present system of indiscriminate endowment out of the public funds for Roman Catholics and Presbyterians, and thereby to level up their *status*. The Conservative party took up the Irish question, and proposed their mode of proceeding, which the other side felt to be wholly unsatisfactory, and were bound not merely to oppose that mode, but to declare what they consider to be the better mode. They considered the mode proposed to open a source of difficulty and of danger, instead of being a messenger of peace and a blessing. After some further observations on this subject, the right honourable gentleman said there was also the other great question relating to Ireland—the land question—which must be dealt with in the order of succession. He had noticed with great pleasure the feeling which had been shown during the recent elections in regard to the Irish question. The right honourable gentleman concluded by saying that he would look forward with cheerfulness to the future. It was idle to suppose that a Church could be popular which ministered only to a portion of the people, and the Church of England might be perfectly content to take her chance among the vicissitudes of coming times, so long as her clergy strove to do their duty. He repudiated the idea that the Roman Catholics sought ascendancy. That was idle talk, and he was not alarmed by such bugbears.

At Birmingham, Mr. Bright, having been re-elected without opposition, gave the electors an account of the circumstances which had led to his own acceptance of office and his views and intentions

on becoming a Minister of the Crown. He said, "Mr. Gladstone, soon after he proceeded to the formation of his Administration, asked me to join him in the Government. I have reason to know that he made that proposition with the cordial and gracious acquiescence of her Majesty the Queen. As you know, I had very strong reasons for refusing to change my seat and place in the House of Commons. The arguments which were used to induce me to change that opinion were arguments based entirely upon what was considered best for the interests of the great Liberal party, and for the public service. And I was obliged to admit, looking at them from that point of view, that they were not easily to be answered." The right honourable gentleman, in further detailing the circumstances under which he accepted office, said that Mr. Gladstone proposed that he (Mr. Bright) should accept the position of Secretary of State for India; but having twelve years ago suffered so much in his health as to cut him off for two years from public labours, he declined accepting the heavy work of the India department. He still entertained the same views on Indian affairs as he had expressed in times past, especially in 1858; but he believed that public opinion had not yet sufficiently advanced to apply those views to the government of India. He therefore said that if he was to accept any office it would be that of President of the Board of Trade, in which he might perhaps do a little good and prevent some harm. At least that office would not so engage him as to render him unable to take some reasonable part in the great public questions which might come before the House of Commons. Although he came before them in a new character, he had not the smallest intention of getting rid of his old one. He hoped that the time had now arrived—it had only recently arrived—when a man might, perhaps, without difficulty act as an honest Minister of the Crown and at the same time as an honest and devoted servant and councillor of the people. "But," said the right honourable gentleman, "I shall have to ask your patience and your lenient judgment of my conduct in regard, it may be, to the questions which I am not now able to specify, but which must come on for consideration and discussion. An Administration, as you know, is composed of some fourteen or fifteen members of the two Houses of Parliament. The questions which the Government itself may propose, and the questions which may be submitted to Parliament by others, will require to be discussed and consulted upon by members of the Cabinet; and you know that unless there be harmony amongst the members of any Administration there must necessarily be failure and disaster. It is therefore possible that in seeking the maintenance of this harmony the members of the Administration may appear at times to take a different line to that which they have taken when unconnected with the Government. If there should be any such occasions—if any one of my constituents should find that I have on any occasion to come been in a lobby different to that in which at some former period I have

been found, let him have such patience as he can ; let him understand this, that until I say I have changed my views my views remain unchanged, and that the different course which I am compelled to take is one which does not affect principle so much as time and opportunity, or that it is a temporary or inevitable concession to the necessity of maintaining harmony of discussion amongst the members of the Government. I must ask you to look always at the general results."

On the 29th of December, the House of Commons having again met, the Members of the Cabinet and others who had been re-elected by their constituencies were sworn in and resumed their seats.

The Ministers who took the oath and subscribed the roll were — The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, First Lord of the Treasury ; the Right Hon. H. C. E. Childers, First Lord of the Admiralty ; the Right Hon. Robert Lowe, Chancellor of the Exchequer ; the Right Hon. E. Cardwell, Secretary of State for War ; the Right Hon. W. E. Forster, Vice-President of the Committee of Council for Education ; the Right Hon. G. J. Goschen, President of the Poor Law Board ; the Right Hon. A. H. Layard, Commissioner of Works and Buildings ; Mr. Stansfeld, Third Lord of the Treasury ; Captain Vivian, Lord of the Treasury ; and Lord J. Hay, Lord of the Admiralty.

Several more writs were moved for members who had accepted office, and various notices of motion having been given for the re-assembling of the House, it was once more adjourned until the 16th of February.

In surveying the transactions of the year which have now been recorded, we find the same chequered aspect of prosperity and disaster, of progress and reaction which, according to the usual course of human affairs, marks these successive periods of our national history. Upon the whole, the year 1868 compares not disadvantageously with those which preceded it in our recent annals. It was marked by no signal misfortune, no conspicuous public calamity ; it was a time, indeed, of keen political struggle and excitement, but unattended by disturbance of the public tranquillity. On the other hand, it was signalized by some events which will be always remembered with satisfaction. Among these the most conspicuous was the Abyssinian Expedition, the complete success of which redounded not more to the honour of our arms than did the spirit of self-abnegation and humanity in which it was undertaken to the credit of our policy. The result of this enterprise was unquestionably to raise the prestige of the British name in the estimation of the civilized world. The year was remarkable also for the election of a new Parliament upon a widely extended basis of representation, an event regarded by some with auguries of hope, by others with prognostications of danger ; it may however be stated with satisfaction, that the first experience at least of the new household suffrage was calculated to mitigate present anxiety,

whatever the ulterior consequences of the Reform Act of 1867 may develop in after times. The retirement from office of Mr. Disraeli's Cabinet and the accession of that of Mr. Gladstone, including in its ranks a large proportion of Parliamentary experience and ability, was the earliest fruit of the new electoral constitution. The internal repose which throughout this year the kingdom enjoyed was subject to no exception even in Ireland. The Fenian outrages which only twelve months before had produced a general feeling of nervous irritation were almost forgotten, although the murder of Mr. D'Arcy M'Gee in Canada, and the attempted assassination of the Duke of Edinburgh in Australia, illustrated the reckless malignity of the more fanatical members of the Fenian body. In Ireland the conspiracy was suspended or dormant; though it would be presumptuous to suppose that disaffection had permanently ceased. The political quietude which, notwithstanding the occurrence of the elections, prevailed throughout the United Kingdom was not to be attributed to exceptional prosperity. The commercial depression which had lasted since the Spring of 1866 still continued to be felt, and a low rate of interest prevailed, which indicated both the stagnation of regular trade and the natural indisposition of capitalists to embark in speculative adventures. In the last days of the year the announcement that the Lancashire cotton-mills were about to work half-time proved that one of the chief branches of English industry was still suffering from want of demand. The traffic returns of railways exhibited a similar want of elasticity; but the gradual cessation of the controversies on revenue and capital which were eagerly prosecuted in the early part of the year indicated an improvement in the condition of the companies, as the financial confusion of their affairs was gradually disentangled. While an unusually productive harvest cheapened food and diminished the necessity for purchases of foreign grain, the hot and dry summer which ripened the wheat crop was extremely unfavourable to the production of roots and fodder, though even this inconvenience was partly compensated by the peculiar mildness of the winter.

The fluctuations in the value of money throughout the year were singularly small, and the rate of interest maintained a very low level. At the commencement of 1868 the bank rate was only two per cent., and it continued at that amount without change until November, when it was advanced, in consequence of a partial drain arising from foreign loans and investments, to two and a half. In the beginning of December a further advance was made to three per cent., which rate continued till the end of the year. The rate of discount of the Bank of France continued at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. throughout the year. The variations in the value of the public funds were also inconsiderable. The lowest price of consols was on January 1, when they opened at $91\frac{1}{2}$ — 92 ; the highest was reached in June, when they were quoted at $95\frac{1}{2}$ ex. div. But the cheapness of money was due not so much to increase of circulation as to deficiency of demand, and the latter is to

be attributed to the still continuing want of confidence after the terrible shocks it underwent from the catastrophe of 1866. Money was forthcoming on easy terms to those who could offer good security, but the spirit of enterprise was utterly damped by the experience of past failures, and the appetite of the public for investments, excepting those of the most solid and familiar kind, was destroyed. Towards the close of the year, symptoms of a disposition to invest money in foreign and colonial securities began to manifest themselves, but great caution was observed by the majority of the monied classes, and any tendency to speedy revival was promptly followed by a reaction, which indicated the sensitive condition of public feeling.

According to the evidence afforded by the Board of Trade returns, the commercial transactions of the country indicated a sound and healthy state of trade. The total declared value of exports for twelve months ending December 31st, 1868, amounted to 179,463,644*l.* against 180,961,923*l.* in 1867. The value of the imports for eleven months ending November 30th was 217,520,365*l.* against 208,526,055*l.* in 1867. The supply of cotton was good, and there was at the end of the year a fair store of it in the north of England. In this respect there was a happy contrast to the last week of 1867. An important advance was effected during the year in the machinery of commercial intercourse. The science of telegraphy made much progress, and the construction of railways rapidly proceeding in different parts of the world, tend to open new avenues for the exchange of commerce, and to enable England to send her productions into the very heart of distant countries. New discoveries of the precious metals were made in various regions; of gold in South Eastern Africa, in Brazil, Canada, and New Zealand; and of silver in Colorado, Nevada, California and South Western America. In Ceylon also some gold was discovered under circumstances which gave promise of considerable supplies. Some was also found in certain streams in China.

The year was distinguished by some remarkable atmospheric phenomena and by violent convulsions of nature. Within the limits of the United Kingdom storms and gales of unusual violence occurred. As the summer was one of the hottest and driest on record, the early part of the winter was marked with the occurrence of destructive storms in the British seas, and with an excessive rainfall in December, which produced extensive inundations in certain districts of England. In other parts of the world tempests of extraordinary violence were reported. In March a terrific cyclone swept over the Mauritius, the effect of which, according to the account transmitted to the Colonial Office by the Governor, was to render no less than 50,000 persons houseless. The more abnormal convulsions of nature, volcanoes and earthquakes, were also unusually prevalent.

On January 3 Vesuvius exhibited great activity, sending forth an immense quantity of lava, with loud detonations. With some

intermissions, the volcano continued to vomit forth its fiery stream for several weeks, characterized by a remarkable periodicity, seemingly indicating some kind of lunar influence. After a period of comparative rest, the mountain became violently agitated in the month of October, and again with still greater vehemence in November. Streams of lava flowed over from the crater, invading cultivated land and doing considerable damage to the villages. Houses and farm lands were overwhelmed, and a large chestnut forest was set on fire. The lava current flowed with a breadth of 130 yards, and a depth of about twelve. Six million cubic metres of lava were estimated as being thrown up in a few days. Before the close of November the eruption died away, and this seemed to be the signal for an outbreak of Mount Etna, which for a brief period put forth a very grand display. Associated with volcanoes comes the subject of earthquakes, and of these the year exhibited several, including the dreadful catastrophe in Peru and Ecuador. Shocks of earthquake were even felt in the British isles, and almost universally throughout the world. On the 27th of March the island of Hawaii, in the Sandwich group, was violently convulsed. A tidal wave, sixty feet in height, swept in from the sea, destroying villages, and drowning both people and cattle. Shocks of more or less violence affected the whole of the group. The great mountain, Manna Loa, broke out into a dreadful eruption, ejecting fire, rocks, ashes, and molten lava. The vibrations of the earth threw down churches, and other buildings, and killed many people. In August a shock of earthquake was felt at Gibraltar, being the first time for many years, and the phenomenon was repeated towards the close of the year. But the most dreadful visitation was in Peru and Ecuador, where a tremendous earthquake took place on the 13th of August, overthrowing numerous cities, and destroying many thousands of lives. The earth rocked with frightful violence, crags fell from the summits of the Andes, immense tidal waves rolled in upon the land, sweeping whole towns from their foundations, and stranding ships of war and merchant vessels far above high-water mark. The ocean was heaved into immense waves, which extended their undulations over the whole of the Pacific, breaking in huge rollers on the shores of California, the Sandwich Islands, Japan, and New Zealand. About the same time the vibrations which for three-quarters of a year had affected the island of St. Thomas, in the West Indies, came to an end. On the 21st of October an earthquake of considerable violence visited California, damaging the city of San Francisco and causing some loss of life. At length, on the 30th of October, a little before eleven at night, England itself was visited with a very palpable shock, which particularly affected the western counties and was felt with great distinctness in South Wales. A slight shock was reported to have previously visited Ireland. Accounts reached this country of an earthquake at Taranaki, in New Zealand, with the destruction of 5000*l.* worth of property.

Other disasters for which the excesses of nature are not accountable, produced destruction of life or property to a considerable, though perhaps not above the average, amount. Fires and explosions, especially those arising from the combustion of inflammable substances, naphtha, nitro-glycerine, and petroleum, occasioned extensive loss of life and destruction of vessels and buildings. Among accidents of this nature was the dreadful railway disaster at Abergele, arising from the ignition of paraffin oil in the trucks, brought through the collision of a goods train into contact with the furnace of the engine. It may perhaps be affirmed that no railway accident in this country ever produced so profound an impression on the public mind.

The losses which the country sustained this year by the deaths of eminent and useful members of the community were rather more numerous than usual. The Church of England was deprived by death of her mild and justly-venerated Primate, Archbishop Longley; of Dean Milman, the poet, scholar, and enlightened Christian historian; of Hampden, Bishop of Hereford, Jeune, Bishop of Peterborough; of Canons Ernest Hawkins and Bentinck, of Westminster; of the Colonial Bishops of Montreal and of Grafton and Armidale, and of the Rev. W. R. Dawes, the astronomer. Lord Brougham, one of the last survivors of a great constellation of brilliant lawyers, and much more than a lawyer in his attainments and fame—Lord Cranworth and Lord Wensleydale, both eminent though retired members of that learned profession; Sir William Shee, a Judge of the Queen's Bench, and Lord Curriehill, of the Scottish Bench, were removed from the scene. Literature was deprived of Sir Edmund Head, Samuel Lover, M. J. Higgins, Eyre Evans Crowe, Edward Jesse, and several more. Science, of Sir David Brewster; Art, of Abraham Cooper, R.A., J. Doyle (H. B.), John Burnet, and G. Cattermole; the Stage, of Charles Kean; the Military and Naval services, of Sir Edward Blakeney, F.M., General Simpson, Sir Hew Ross, F.M., Sir George Wetherall, Sir Henry Chads, and a long list of other officers; while of those who had served their country in various capacities and with eminent desert, we may select for conspicuous mention the names of Sir James Brooke, of Sarawak, Sir Herbert Edwardes, a premature loss to his country, and Sir Richard Mayne. The survey of such a list of eminent citizens removed within the compass of twelve short months from the scene of their labours, suggests at first view a melancholy sense of our national bereavement; but when we consider that each recurring year is found to render a somewhat similar tribute of eminent victims to mortality, we derive from the fact at least this consolatory reflection, that a nation which is continually yielding such spoils to the grave must be rich in the power of producing the higher specimens of humanity, and of perennially renewing that supply of public virtues and intellectual energy which sustains, under Providence, the strength and greatness of the empire.

FOREIGN HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

FRANCE.

Political state of the Empire—Reception of the Diplomatic Body by the Emperor—Reports of debates in the Chambers by newspapers—Budget—Debate on the Army Organization Bill—Bill relating to the Liberty of the Press—Debate on the Bill for fixing the Army Contingent—Pamphlet on the Policy of the Second Empire—Speech of M. Baroche at Rambouillet—Discussion on Free Trade—Speech of the Emperor at Rouen—Discussion on the Budget—Municipal and Civic Loans—Approaching Ecumenical Council at Rome—M. Grévy opposition candidate for the Jura—Incident at the distribution of prizes in the Sorbonne—New political map of France—The Baudin subscription—Death of M. Berryer—Changes in the French Ministry.

THE view taken by the French Government of the political aspect of affairs at the beginning of the year, is shown by the following article which appeared in the *Moniteur*:—

“The year begins under favourable auspices. Peace is not disturbed in any part of Europe. Thanks to the wisdom of nations and their Governments, it may be hoped that the questions which occupy the attention of diplomacy will be amicably settled upon satisfactory terms. The peoples, enlightened as to their interests and duties, are called upon to assist one another in the work of progress as the object of their common efforts. The lessons of 1867 will not be lost. The anarchical attempts in Spain, England, and Italy have encountered just reprobation from the good sense of the populations. Faithful to the traditions of her policy, France continues to fulfil her civilizing mission. The Universal Exhibition has become the symbol of those ideas of brotherhood and solidarity which form the honour of our age. At home France has understood how to reconcile the principle of authority with the regular exercise of wise and fertile liberty. The country has availed itself of every opportunity to testify its gratitude to the Emperor, and has once more shown in the recent debates of the Chambers the intimate agreement existing between it and the Government. Abroad France has exerted her influence in favour of the peace and general interests of Europe. If France has energetically sup-

ported the Pontifical throne, it was because the cause of the Holy See was that of right and justice, based upon treaties. France, by opposing the excesses of revolutionary factions, has rendered a signal service to the Papacy, to the Government of Victor Emmanuel, and to the whole of Italy. France, in inviting indiscriminately all the European Powers to facilitate by the moral authority of their collective counsels the work of conciliation, has given a new proof of her political impartiality. The Government of the Emperor, which has received the testimonies of sympathy from various Governments, hopes to cause the practical value of its proposals to be recognized."

But a very different view was given by the Opposition press, and we quote some passages from one of its journals which show the other side of the picture.

"Business is every where in a suffering state; the metallic reserve in the Bank exceeds a thousand millions of francs, the winter is severe, and we are receiving the most lamentable accounts from Rouen, Lyons, and all the great manufacturing centres. The state of other nations is not less disquieting. England, subject to a general conspiracy, is trembling, notwithstanding her moral force, and is uneasy for her material prosperity. Italy, humiliated and thrown into disorder by the second Roman expedition of France, is agitated by a crisis which may from one moment to another extend beyond her frontier and become general. Prussia and Russia, shrewdly taking advantage of the faults and short-sightedness of France, are advancing towards their ends, the one in Germany, and the other in the East, Prussia not concerning herself more for the treaty of Prague than Russia for that of Paris. Europe, become an immense barrack, is covering herself more and more with soldiers, who ruin the populations, and are leading the Governments to bankruptcy; the phantom of the old coalitions is beginning to disturb the imaginations, and M. Gressier astonished no one in saying that war, and a great war; was the only means of putting an end to a state of affairs which is weighing on all minds and all interests. But if France is compelled, in spite of herself, to engage in war, on what conditions, and aided by whom, will it be carried on? We know who are our enemies; they are strong and numerous! But where are our allies? Thus we have reason to repeat that the year which is ending is a melancholy one."

On receiving the congratulations of the Papal Nuncio as the representative of the diplomatic body at the Tuileries on New Year's Day, the Emperor replied,—

"I am happy to begin the new year, as usual, surrounded by the representatives of all the Powers. I am able to affirm once more my constant desire to maintain the best relations with them. I thank you for the wishes you have been good enough to express in their name for France, my family, and myself."

And in answer to the Archbishop of Paris the Emperor said :—

“The prayers you address to Heaven for the Empress, the Prince Imperial, and myself affect me deeply. They spring from a noble heart. I know that you do not separate religious interests from those of the country and of civilization.”

When Count von der Goltz, the newly accredited Minister to the French Court from the North German Confederation, was presented at the Tuileries, the Emperor thus addressed him :—

“In notifying to me the new functions with which you are invested as the representative of the Confederation of the North, you renew the assurances of the friendship of the King of Prussia. I thank you for it. On my part, I embrace the opportunity with pleasure to confirm the good understanding existing between the two Governments. I beg of you to be the interpreter of my sentiments to the king. Having been able to appreciate the high qualities which distinguish you, I do not doubt that you will continue as heretofore to exert all your efforts to maintain between the two countries that friendly understanding which is the pledge of their prosperity, and a guarantee for the peace of Europe.”

By the forty-second Article of the Constitution, reports of the sittings of the Legislative body by the journals, or by any other medium of publicity, are to consist only of the reproduction of the minutes drawn up after each sitting, under the supervision of the President of the Legislative Corps. This was modified by the *Senatus Consultum* of the 2nd of February, 1861, by which an abridged report of the debates was to be made out for all the journals, except the official *Moniteur*, by the secretaries of the Chamber under the supervision of the President; and this was the only report which they were to be allowed to publish under a heavy penalty.

Several journals at the beginning of the year had published comments or “articles” upon these reports, which they had faithfully copied as given to them by the secretaries of the Chamber, and this was considered by the Government as an infraction of the law, for which prosecutions were commenced against them all.

In the Corps Législatif, M. Picard censured these proceedings, and declared that the right of discussion had been suppressed by the prosecutions.

M. Rouher (Minister of State) replied that, despite the warnings given at the beginning of every Session by the Government to the newspapers, some of them still persisted in violating the forty-second Article of the Constitution. The Government did not in any manner wish to challenge the right of discussion on Bills voted by the Chamber, but forbade a report to be published in addition to the official report. This was a question for the courts of law to consider.

M. Thiers asserted the full right of the public press to discuss the sittings of the Chambers; as all other public authorities were

allowed to be discussed, the Corps Législatif could not be made an exception. This was a question of independence and dignity for the Corps Législatif.

M. Rouher replied that the terms of the Constitution allowed two official reports, but prohibited a third. The courts of law had to decide the point as to the right of the press to discuss or publish their own report of the legislative proceedings. Referring to an interpellation made in the Senate in 1861, M. Rouher concluded that the Government had not the slightest wish to paralyze the right of discussion, which remained intact.

All the journals were summarily convicted before the Juge d'Instruction, and the proprietors were condemned to pay fines of various amounts¹.

In the middle of January the Minister of the Interior sent the following circular to each of the prefects of departments:—

“M. le Préfet,—The Government has frequently declared, both before and during the debates on the Army Bill, that it desired peace, and that all its efforts would be directed to maintain it. The Administration cannot hold two different tones, because it has not two different policies. The essential point, therefore, is that the journals which support us should not accredit alarms nor propagate certain inquietudes. The discussions provoked by the Army Bill may have been carried too far, but they must now more than ever be brought into harmony with the pacific disposition which the Emperor and his Ministers have time after time expressed. I request you, therefore, to carefully see that the journals which support us do not depart from the declarations made by the Government. Nothing alarms the public mind so much as contradictions, and nothing reassures and fortifies it more than harmony of language and of guidance.”

The budget of the Minister of Finance, M. Magne, was presented to the Emperor at the end of January, and we extract the following paragraphs:—

“FLOATING DEBT.

“An excessive importance is attributed to the amount of the floating debt when it is considered as the exact expression of the financial position of the country. That amount varies from day to day, and sometimes undergoes very large fluctuations, without the groundwork of things being changed. On the 1st of December,

¹ A statement headed “Three Months of Liberal Empire” was published by the *Temps*, as showing what was meant by the Liberty of the Press in France. From this it appeared from the 1st of June to the 31st of August there were forty-one sentences for press offences, pronounced against fifty-eight persons, fifteen condemnations to imprisonment, and forty-nine to fines. Two of the fines were of the large amount of 10,000f., three were of 5000f., twenty ranged from 5000f. to 2000f. Only one paper, the *Opinion Nationale* was acquitted. Several, acquitted in the first instance, were condemned by the higher court to which the Government appealed. Three papers were suppressed altogether, and of several the sale in the streets was forbidden.

1866, it reached the sum of 970 millions; and on the 1st of December last it had fallen to 936 millions, without any financial event having warranted that diminution. Of itself, therefore, the extent of the floating debt—the object of such frequent discussions—is not a sure indication, and its real signification must be sought for in its composition, which may comprise elements of a more or less delicate nature, and still more in its mode of employment.

“ORDINARY BUDGET OF 1868.

“The ordinary budget of 1868 was fixed by the law of the 18th of July, 1867, with a surplus of receipts amounting to 124 millions. New facts will involve the following modifications:—The indirect taxes have produced in 1867, as compared with 1866, a surplus which, added to that of the direct taxes, and of some other resources, form a total of 25,270,448*f.* That amount, being added to the original estimates of 1868, which have been calculated on those of 1866, increase the receipts to 1,698,725,033*f.* On the other hand, the expenses have suffered an augmentation due to different causes, some permanent, and others exceptional and unavoidable; namely,—

Rise in the prices of rations for men and horses (2)	F.
(War and Marine)	24,000,000
Increase of the dietary scale, admitted in the extra-ordinary rectificative budget of 1867, and fixed at five centimes	5,314,000
Organization of the army on a footing of 400,000 men	16,000,000
Guard National Mobile	5,000,000
Different services of the marine and colonies	2,700,000
Public instruction (execution of the new laws)	1,313,000
Expenses of Government manufactures	415,448
Divers credits in the other Ministerial Departments	5,682,745

“Those augmentations raise the total expenditure, less the thirteen millions of *annulations*, to 1,596,325,000*f.*; the receipts, rectified, being 1,698,722,033*f.* The surplus of income will be, in round numbers, 102,000,000*f.*

“Further requisitions are, no doubt, to be expected. The financial measure, which will be presently referred to, and the situation of the communes already aided (3), will give to that event a character of probability which I have been obliged to take into account. I have consequently thought it preferable not to anticipate and to keep in reserve the increases of receipts which may occur in 1868.

“ Sire, I have carefully studied the situation of the finances; I have described it as simply and as exactly as I have been able, without exaggerating it in a favourable sense or otherwise; I have proposed, without hesitation, such measures as the circumstances have seemed to me to require; and I trust that they will have the result, by balancing the present, of preparing a

better future. The patriotism of the country is about to impose on itself great sacrifices; but it will gain the better guarantee of peace which results from strength, not of that unquiet and suspicious peace during which each nation, by the fear of a conflict, is incessantly damaging its own prosperity and its credit; but a peace, calm, confident, and fruitful, based on a common understanding and a mutual respect; such as your Majesty in your far-seeing wisdom is pursuing with your desires and your efforts."

The Army Organization Bill was passed in January by the Corps Législatif, after a vigorous opposition, by a majority of 200 against 60 votes. It came before the Senate at the end of the month, and in the course of the debate that ensued, Baron Brennier said,—

"I look at this Bill from the point of view of the greatness and security of France. It has been said that 400,000 men are an army sufficient to guarantee the country; and, with a good system of fortresses and Paris protected, I agree in that opinion. But with the former law did that force exist? No; for in 1862 there were only 264,000, and in 1864 no more than 233,000 men. All deductions made, the entire effective force under the plan now proposed will not exceed 540,000, and I doubt whether, in the present military position of other Powers, that number will be sufficient to assure to France the rank which she ought to hold. Conventional right having ceased to exist, force now reigns in Europe; and we must be strong in order to preserve ourselves free and independent. Prussia, Austria, and Russia can put 4,000,000 soldiers on foot, and Italy might join her 900,000 to those of the Northern Powers, because Italy has shown ingratitude for the immense sacrifices made in her favour. France must therefore maintain herself on the highest level, not only in courage and patriotism, but in the number of her soldiers and the perfection of her arms. In Bavaria, in Saxony, in Sweden the number of soldiers, effective and reserve, as compared with the population, would, in the same proportion, give to France 1,590,000 men. The sacrifices are great, no doubt, but I desire the forces of my country to be on a footing of equality with those of foreign Powers. In my opinion, Prussia will achieve her work as rapidly as possible, and absorb the smaller States, already half expropriated on the score of public utility. She is preparing to act and will do so by surprise, for such is her habit. Remember how she swooped down like a bird of prey upon Austria. By the efforts of Count Bismarck, the German Empire will be reconstituted, and, in presence of that portentous reappearance, France must fortify herself effectually. The evacuation of Luxembourg by Prussia has only served to enable her to strengthen Saarbrück and Saarlouis, and the value of frontier fortresses is well known to Prussian statesmen, because, in 1815, Prince Hardenburg, the head of the Berlin Cabinet, claimed, in order to annihilate the aggressive power of France, all our fortresses on the Meuse and the Saar, and he wanted Alsace into the

bargain, as forming part of the defensive system of Germany. We must therefore arm, in order to teach the nation that it cannot be powerful without sacrifices, and that in order to have the right to live and be influential it must have numerous and patriotic soldiers. I believe every citizen, without exception, should be a soldier, but I offer no amendment to this Bill. I only ask the Ministers present whether they deem it sufficient, not alone to secure the safety of French territory, but to make our influence felt abroad. By sometimes inspiring terror France has always made herself respected; and, for my part, I would not permit a stroke of policy to take place in Europe without our permission. I solicit a reply from the Government."

General Count De la Rue.—The new plan, while preserving the principles of the law of 1832, will be less burdensome to the country in time of peace, and will produce in time of war an army more formidable than France has as yet set on foot. The Prussian system has been erroneously supposed to be suited to France, but the social organization of that country is aristocratic and agricultural; and military service here could not be framed upon that of Germany. The present Bill meets the principle of equality and the commercial and manufacturing conditions of our nation. But if we were dynastically united as Prussia is, our military strength would be far greater. Nevertheless our army is excellent in spirit and material force, and in aptitude for war is superior to that of any foreign State; but France must be henceforth always armed, and well armed; and that the nation may be taught to know this, all that is necessary is to show that commercial and industrial pursuits have to a large extent drawn away the young men. Civil life offers now more attractions than the military career. However, the proposed reserve will be far superior to the Prussian Landwehr in instruction and training, thanks to the admirable system of organization of our active army, which the German States envy us. As to the National Guard Mobile, its organization promises the most satisfactory results. In conclusion, our country is, no doubt, becoming more and more democratic, and this fact must be accepted; but democracy, to turn its enthusiasm to useful purpose, must be regularly organized and severely disciplined; and then a nation like France may be assured of maintaining its preponderance abroad and its security at home.

M. Rouland.—This Bill involves the *minimum* of the efforts we ought to make; it is a concession reduced to the most indispensable necessities. This is the moment for the Senate to react against the passions, errors, and distrust brought to bear upon this measure, and the object of which is to weaken the respect which France entertains for the Emperor and for his Government. What is the present situation of Europe? One of disquietude and agitation. There is a milliard unemployed in the Bank, and when every one elsewhere is asking for money, the Finance Minister does well to think first of France. I like to remind our neighbours

of this, "War can only be made with money; you have little, and we have much; remain quiet, then; if peace be your wish, so it is ours." This is the favourable aspect of large accumulations of disposable capital which arise from disquietude and distrust in the public mind, although for a month past we have had the most pacific assurances. But suppose these assurances to be falsified by events, how will the Bill before us meet the case? Its fault is that it provides only for the future, not for the present, and this is the reproach I make to the Government. Something more energetic and more complete ought to have been proposed. Every where around us Europe is arming, and we ought not to act like the foolish bird which when danger is abroad hides its head under its wing. There ought to be something more than the principle of the law of 1832, the insufficiency of which is recorded in the difficulties of bringing the effective into the field of battle. One journal of large circulation has said that France is no longer a nation, but a camp; its young men no longer citizens, but conscripts; and that the measure creates a million and a half of illustrious executioners. The writer says that the Government of Napoleon III. has universalized the military *corvée*.

M. de Chabrier.—That is an indignity.

M. Rouland.—But different sentiments have been expressed in the journals; the press, however, ought not to confound violence with liberty. Again, the Bill it was stated would engender despotism and stifle liberty. But where is despotism in the proposed plan? Where are the Pretorians? Another system of attack would seem to aim at producing the indifference and selfishness which cost the Government of July so dear; but France will never say to others, "Do what you please." No, this is impossible. Peace *partout et toujours*, at that time proclaimed by the Minister, brought affront and humiliation to France, as appears by the history of the period, and that was one of the causes which brought about the downfall of the Government of July. But the present Sovereign, who for seventeen years has been able to conciliate the conservative principles of society with the rights of the human mind and with political progress, cares nothing for the attacks made upon him; and the country will know what to think of this opposition. As to the economical objection, I say that commerce and industry require protection and security, and for this object force is necessary to repel aggression. The additional cost is an economical outlay, and the commercial class and the country are well aware of this. When the country is strong, thanks to the patriotism and prudence of the Emperor, then industry and business transactions may proceed in security, and disquietude will disappear.

M. Chevalier, in a long speech, strongly opposed the Bill. He said that the nations of Europe were no longer hostile to each other; on the contrary, they were animated by feelings of reciprocal esteem and good will, and the modern inventions of railroads, telegraphs, &c., had placed them in constant communication. They

only wanted to be united in friendship, and even the Governments which wished them to be at enmity would probably be disappointed. Sovereigns themselves now were not so desirous of war as some people imagined. France had recently seen the most powerful potentates of the Continent in her capital. They came not to improve themselves in the military art; they came to contemplate the wonderful productions of the country; not to pay homage to her military glory, but to admire the arts of peace, the real elements of the prosperity of nations; and they thus gave a pledge of their solicitude for the welfare of the nations whose destinies were confided to them. He saw nowhere in Europe any sign of violent antipathy, or of those conflicting interests which would justify France in apprehending aggressions for which it was indispensable for her to make these urgent preparations. Had those Sovereigns felt hostility against her they never would have visited Paris as they did last summer. M. Chevalier passed in review the whole of the great States in order to show that nowhere did any feeling of enmity exist against the French people. He said,—“And, first of all, let us look at England. In former times England was very warlike, and warlike against France. France had inflicted much evil on her; but she had paid that evil back. In the present day England adopted in respect of Europe a policy essentially pacific—a policy of non-intervention. The programme of her foreign policy was quite new; it was a programme which probably Pitt, in the celestial abode where he is, if he is there, would not approve. English policy now consisted in not meddling, or in meddling as little as possible, with the affairs of Europe, and in avoiding war with any one whatever whenever it was possible without the manifest sacrifice of her dignity.”

A Senator here observing that England was augmenting her armaments more than ever, M. Chevalier said, “England is exerting herself to cover the world with flourishing colonies, and to develope by means of liberal institutions the establishments she has planted every where. She is carrying out this great design with consummate skill. It is her only foreign policy. From England, therefore, there is no danger of an attack on France. Let us now look at Austria. Is it Austria that disturbs your quiet? Is it against Austria that you want to make those preparations? I do not suppose it is. Is it Russia? Frankly speaking, Russia is too distant from us for any hypothesis of a war between France and Russia to be seriously discussed. And as for Prussia, she has too much to do at home to expose herself to the embarrassments, the difficulties, and the peril of a foreign war. I do not, then, hesitate to declare that we are menaced by no one. The impression we make on Europe is not that of people who can be threatened with impunity. We are rather a cause of disquiet to others than others to us.”

He admitted that the transformation of Germany in the summer of 1866 had disclosed a change in the balance of power in the

world; but what passed in Germany in consequence of the battle of Sadowa manifested a fact previously existing on which they should have thought sooner. Previous to those events in Germany France was of opinion that she was the arbiter of Europe; yet, for a long time past, France, as well as every other Power, should have renounced that ambition. For a long series of years England also had aspired, and not without success, to be the arbiter of Europe and of the world. There were moments when she was so, as France had been in other periods. But it became evident for the last twenty years that it belonged to no one Power to dominate and direct Europe, and that it was dangerous to continue the attempt. The British Cabinet had abandoned those lofty pretensions; it turned its attention to other things, and by doing so gave a proof of its wisdom and the correctness of its judgment. What happened in Germany in 1866 was merely a warning to the other Powers, and to France as well as to them, that no one must again aim at being the arbiter of Europe.

M. Chevalier concluded by saying, "The Empire began with a device proclaimed at Bordeaux, 'The Empire is peace.' I desire that this device should again be proclaimed in 1868, with even more solemnity; and the effect would be most salutary in Europe. Peace has also its grandeur. Is there any thing nobler, any spectacle more imposing, than that of a people engaged in the great enterprises of an industry which covers the seas with its ships, which raises every class employed in it to the dignity of free citizens, respecting the laws and prosperous, their mind cultivated by instruction, and presenting a vast union grouped with respect and gratitude round a throne raised by their spontaneous suffrages? It is a glorious example to set to the world. It depends upon us to set that example; and I much doubt that this new military law can show any thing like it. Let us, then, exhort the Government to resume, firmly and solemnly, the device the Emperor adopted amid the acclamations of France and of Europe at Bordeaux in 1852; and we shall have done more for the greatness of our country and the consolidation of our institutions than by passing a law, the intrinsic value of which, after all, is, in the judgment of many military men, extremely problematical."

M. Chevalier was followed by Marshal Niel, the Minister of War, and after two days' debate the Bill was passed by a majority of 125 to 1, the single dissident being M. Chevalier.

A Bill to relieve the press from certain restrictions was brought into the Corps Législatif at the end of January, and gave rise to a long debate. It proposed to abolish previous authorization as necessary for establishing a tribunal, and the power of the Minister of the Interior and Prefects to give warnings (*avertissements*), and to suspend the publication of newspapers, but it retained the power of inflicting very heavy fines and the *loi des signatures*; that is, every journalist was to put his name to each article written by him. And a conviction for offending against

the law was to have the effect of a deprivation for a time of civil rights.

During the discussion M. Thiers observed that there existed many subjects which ought to be prohibited from discussion by the public press; for instance, the bases of society and matters of private life, and in constitutional countries the Sovereign was shielded by the responsibility of the Ministers. But beyond those limits all acts of the public authorities were open to discussion. M. Thiers said that it was impossible to define exactly the offences of the press. Notwithstanding the improvements proposed by the present Bill, the liberty of the press would still remain in the hands of the Government. M. Thiers concluded that it was advisable to grant full liberty to the press, and not to lose so decisive an opportunity for effecting that object.

M. Pinard, the Minister of the Interior, said that the press is a power acclimatized in France. Its influence is good and evil at the same time. Its present tendency is towards violence, and a defence is therefore necessary, which must be placed under the guardianship, not of individuals, but of the law. The Minister then showed that the character of the Bill was liberal in principle, notwithstanding the caution-money required, which was a necessary guarantee, and the stamp, which was merely a tax upon the circulation. The Bill was not stringent in the penalties it imposed, but vigilant in the course of procedure it laid down. It realized the promises of the 19th of January, 1867, which were not desired by the Conservatives, and had not been hoped for by the Liberals. These promises formed part of the logical consequences of a Constitution capable of improvement, and reconciled the natural movement towards progress with the instinct of preservation and with the Constitution of 1852. It was power which led to liberty. The Bill extended, and did not restrict, the promises of the 19th of January, but against violent attacks the Conservative party would find the Government entrenched behind the law.

M. Jules Favre said that the Opposition would vote for the Bill in so far as it abolished the necessity for preliminary authorization and the monopoly of publishing and printing, but there were other portions of the Bill which required modification. The subjection of the press since 1852 had produced abroad the expedition to Mexico, and had made France play a secondary part in 1866, and at home it had caused a complete stagnation in public business, a new loan, anxiety, and disasters. He blamed the blows which had been directed against the press, and which had condemned it to silence. He concluded that the system of a free press ought to be adopted without apprehensions being entertained of the passing agitation which might result therefrom.

M. Granier de Cassagnac asked why the Bill was presented. The majority did not ask for it, nor was it accepted by the Opposition. It would cause trouble to society in general, and

would only contribute to give additional strength to the adversaries of the Government. M. Granier de Cassagnac concluded by asking a postponement of the Bill until, political passions being appeased and the violence of parties disarmed, it would be possible to adopt the system in force in England.

M. Rouher said, "The Government has honestly accepted the work entrusted to its care. A certain amount of anxiety had been shown respecting the opportuneness of the Bill. We have carefully examined the question, and from that examination have come to the firm conclusion to sustain the Bill energetically. We had entered into an engagement, and a strong Government should never retreat from its engagements. We do not fear the Press. We have the means to keep it within bounds." M. Rouher did not believe in the modification of party feeling, but in its impotency. He said, "The majority ought therefore to side with the resolutions of the Government, and not allow a division in its ranks. A new generation has arisen. Four millions of electors who made the first Empire are dead. Four millions of new electors have thrown new life into the nation ; they should not be stopped, but guided."

The opposition to some of the provisions of the Bill was so strong, and there was such a division of opinion amongst the usual supporters of the Government, that the Ministry seriously contemplated its withdrawal. Several Cabinet councils were held at which the Emperor was present, but the result was a determination to proceed with the measure.

An amendment was proposed that offences against the press should be tried by a jury, but this was lost by 199 against 35 votes. The 9th article provided that "the publication by a journal or other periodical of an article signed by a person deprived of his civil and political rights, and to whom the territory of France is forbidden, is punished with a fine of from 1000f. to 5000f., imposed on the editors and managers of the said journal or periodical."

M. Rouher, who supported this article, declared that it was not an aggressive act ; nor a fresh sentence of exile, as M. Jules Simon had described it, it was in his eyes rather a measure of justice and dignity than any thing else. Those who cannot be responsible for their acts, he alleged, must not be allowed to commit offences in France. It was not from weakness or from apprehension that the Government proposed the 9th article. It was alleged that if the Government believed itself strong it had nothing to fear ; and, if weak, that no military cordon could protect it. The Minister declared that the Government was strong, because it represented constitutionally the rights and interests of the country. The Government was by no means apprehensive, but he considered that it was for the dignity of the press itself that the 9th article should stand. The Minister seemed, indeed, anxious to get rid of the task put upon him as soon as possible ; he said it was one of those questions that did not need any lengthened discussion, and he begged the Chamber to pass it forthwith.

M. Jules Favre refused, however, to let it pass without a few remarks. On behalf of the dignity of the press, invoked by the Minister, and for the sake of equity, he opposed the article, which he denounced as a useless prescription, and a blot in the Bill they were then discussing. It was an innovation in the laws, and therefore should be regarded with suspicion by the Chamber; and the present Government was the very last that should introduce it. Those who advised such a measure must have been actuated by motives which they should not have allowed to influence them. When the Minister of State spoke of not allowing the press to raise a pedestal for "dangerous popularities, because they awakened old affections," he mistook his dates, and he seemed to be thinking of 1844 or 1846. Yet in these years nothing like what was now introduced had ever been proposed by the Government, and it was highly creditable to it. If such an article was not prompted by rancour, it looked very like it. For the last seventeen years the Government had gone through some trials, and yet an article of this kind did not exist. Nothing whatever justified it, least of all under the Government of a Prince who was himself at one time an exile. Such a law was not French. It was a great misfortune when iniquity insinuated itself into the administration of justice; but it was greater when it was set forth in the law, and had for its object the oppression of the exile.

The article was carried by a large majority.

When the clause relating to the reports of the debates in the Chambers was under discussion M. Thiers made a speech, in which he said that a Government ought to wish to be freely discussed. As legislators, the Chamber might wish to prevent inaccuracies in the reports, but could not desire to stop all criticism of the debates. The equivocal position which had arisen with regard to this question had been entirely brought about by the Government, which, after promising reforms, had begun to feel regret at the loss of its absolute power. In order to escape from this embarrassment it was necessary to modify the decree of February. The dignity of the Legislative Body required that an end should be put to the present intolerable state of things. It was impossible to criticize the debates in the Chambers without mentioning the details of such debates, which were the very subject of the criticism.

M. Baroche.—But this would be a report of the discussion.

M. Thiers replied that he took note of the fact that the Government persisted in this view of the legal question; and he concluded his speech by urging the adoption of an amendment, which proposed that the journals should be allowed to publish analyses of the debates.

M. Granier de Cassagnac continued the debate. He said, "The press has the right freely to discuss every incident which takes place during the debates, but a report of the discussion must not be given by the journals under the disguise of criticism. The

prohibition of the publication of the reports of the sittings can in no way fetter the journals in their criticisms."

The Bill was finally passed on the 12th of March by a majority of 240 to 1—M. Berryer alone voting against it.

It was afterwards introduced into the Senate, and passed into a law by that body in the month of May.

The Minister of the Interior afterwards issued a circular to the Prefects to instruct them as to the mode of carrying the law into execution. He said, "When the judiciary authorities have to commence a prosecution of a political character they should have an understanding with you. To them alone belongs the solution of the question of legality, but you will frequently have to decide on that of opportunity. That position implies the existence between you and the public prosecutor of constant relations and a harmony more than ever necessary. It also requires that you should not bring under the notice of the Procureur-Impérial any article until you shall have first referred it to me, and that you should keep me regularly informed as to the progress as well as the results of each prosecution. Towards the writer who does not fall under the application of the repressive laws you have a double duty to fulfil—that of surveillance and that of maintaining good relations. The first is indispensable in order that you may be in a position to rectify incorrect statements, as the more the press discusses the acts and intentions of the authorities the more necessity is there to have the truth re-established. You may have recourse either to a 'communicated note,' which is a direct reply to the journal that has led the public into error, or you may have a contradiction published in another print. These two modes of rectification are only of real use when resorted to without delay. They do not strike the mind of the reader unless the correction is brief in form and to the point, avoiding heat of disputation and tediousness of discussion; they ought to be confined to re-establishing the misquoted figure or the erroneous fact. As hitherto, you will be good enough to submit to me in the first place every 'communicated note,' together with the article it refers to. The duty of maintaining good relations is the best means of defence, for it compromises neither the dignity of the authorities nor the independence of the writer; you will be able to keep up such connexions with all those who may in sincerity address themselves to you. When essential questions create no division these relations may frequently lead to voluntary rectifications being made; they may, by bringing persons together, conduce to a conformity of ideas; they are at least calculated to secure more justice in the estimate of intentions, and are of a nature to prevent personal offence, and eliminate from discussion that element of aggressiveness which sometimes separates men more widely from each other than do differences of principle."

When the Bill fixing the army contingent at 100,000 men came before the Corps Législatif on the 4th of March, M. Rouher said

that the relations of France with foreign Powers were excellent, and that the clouds which had begun to appear, and which had caused various alarming reports, were now entirely dispelled.

Marshal Niel made a speech, in which he said, "The Opposition will soon have reason to regret having attacked the new military organization of France; that organization will be a pledge of safety for the country; it will fall less heavily on the population than the former one, and will be more economical. Next spring the whole French army will be armed with the new rifle, the most perfect known. In consequence of its adoption in France all the other Powers are obliged to reform their armaments. France has a two years' start of them, which is a great thing, considering the events which have been accomplished in Europe. Protected by this strong organization, the country may devote itself in security to the labours of peace."

A Bill to authorize the holding of public meetings (*droit de réunion*) was brought into the Chamber in the month of March. It was divided into three sections: 1, relating to Public Meetings non-political; 2, Meetings held for electoral purposes; 3, General regulations. The first three articles of the first section provided,—

"1. Public meetings may be held without previous authorization, on the conditions prescribed by the following articles; but public meetings held for the purpose of treating political or religious matters continue subject to that authorization.

"2. Every meeting must be preceded by a declaration, signed by seven persons having their domicile in the commune where it is to be held, and in full possession of their civil and political rights. That declaration must mention the names, professions, and residences of the persons signing it; and the place, the day, and the hour of such meeting, as well as the special and precise object of it.

"3. A meeting cannot be held any where but in an enclosed and covered place, nor can it be prolonged after the hour fixed by the competent authority for closing places of public resort."

As to political meetings article 8 provided, "Electoral meetings may be held from the date of the promulgation of the decree convoking the college for the election of a deputy to the Legislative Body, to the fifth day before that fixed for the opening of the ballot. None but the electors of the district and the candidates who have complied with the formalities prescribed by the first article of the *Senatus Consultum* of the 17th of February, 1858, can be present at the meeting. Before being admitted to it they must make known their name, profession, and residence. The meeting can only take place one clear day after the receipt immediately following the declaration be delivered."

During the debate on this Bill, in answer to M. Jules Favre, M. Rouher said, "The right of meeting such as you desire would be the re-establishment of clubs. The country can remember the sanguinary agitation which resulted from those institutions. The

Government is afraid, you say. Yes, it is so, if you so interpret its patriotic solicitude for the preservation of the tranquillity and prosperity of the country. The Government is desirous of maintaining that peace which it alone has assured. You fancy that you represent progress; you only represent a worn-out, antiquated, vanquished opinion. You are behindhand in the darkest pages of our history."

The Bill passed through both the Chambers, but not without opposition. In the Senate twenty-six members voted against it.

A pamphlet was published in March which excited a good deal of attention as it was an elaborate attempt to vindicate the Emperor's policy during his reign, and was with good reason supposed to have been inspired, if not written, by himself. The preface stated, "We have had the idea of collecting in one publication the divers manifestations of the national will which, under the two Republics and under the two Empires, have founded the Napoleonic dynasty. It has seemed to us that from that conjunction, curious for history, a great political lesson would result."

We will quote one or two passages from the work.

"Prince Louis Napoleon had accepted the prolongation of his powers as President of the Republic. Strong with the popular sentiment, he hoped that ten years of firm and liberal authority would suffice to repair the ruin which had taken place and restore order to society. But France did not desire such instability in her institutions; the monarchical sentiment was roused in her with irresistible violence. Amid the ovations he received in the course of his visit to the departments, Prince Louis Napoleon perceived every where the desire for the re-establishment of the Empire. All the Councils-General sent up addresses expressing the same wish. A memorable speech was pronounced by the Prince in the city of Bordeaux, which became, so to speak, the cradle of the Imperial monarchy."

Then follow the address of the Senate at St. Cloud (November 4, 1852); the *Senatus Consultum* proposing the *plébiscite* for the election of the Emperor; the Message of the Prince President to the Deputies (November 25); the number of voters for the Empire (7,824,189); and the address of Napoleon III. "to the great bodies of the State" after the re-establishment of the Empire (December 1, 1852).

"What results, above all, from the *exposé* is that six times in the course of half a century the Napoleonic dynasty has received the sanction of universal suffrage. The uncle and the nephew have gone through the same historic cycle. Both have saved France from the abyss. Each elected three times, they have both held power for a time, soon prolonged, and both have been raised to a throne which they found vacant. The Consulate and the Presidency ended in the Empire. It is the only example in history, after an interval of fifty years, through so many events which kept it down, where

the popular will, like a river that has long disappeared in the sands, gushed out again from the depths of society, and spread its level of national independence and grandeur. The *plébiscite* of 1852 responds like an echo to the *plébiscite* of 1804. . . . The Constitution of the 14th of January, 1852, is become, as is known, the Constitution of the Empire. The result of the change effected in the form of Government has been to abrogate or to amend several articles which were no longer in harmony with the new state of things. It has seemed to us useless to point out these differences; the intelligence of the reader can fill them up. As regards modifications of another kind, they result from the divers *Senatus Consulta*. As they mark, so to say, the advance of the Emperor's government in the liberal course on which he has entered, we limit ourselves to indicating such of them as have most importance, and to enumerating the great measures which have been the almost immediate consequence of them. We may mention the Act which allowed the journals to publish the debates of the Senate, and permitted the reproduction *in extenso*, by shorthand, of those of both Chambers; the presence of the Ministers in the Chambers by special delegation; the right of interpellation; the extension to the Legislative Body of the right of amendment; the power given to the Senate to send back for a second examination by the Legislative Body the laws which may appear to it defective; the vote of the Budget by great sections; the renunciation by the Emperor of the prerogative of opening supplemental or extraordinary credits in the absence of the Chambers; the increased attributions of the Councils-General and Municipal Councils; the law on the liberty of the press; the law on coalitions; and, finally, the law, which is now pending, on the right of meeting. The whole of those acts spring from the Constitution, which lends itself to all the movements of liberty, and which, in this respect, is as novel as it is bold and fruitful. In order to estimate its liberal character we have only to compare it to the Constitutions of preceding monarchies."

On the occasion of laying the foundation-stone of a new church at Rambouillet in the month of March, M. Baroche, the Minister of Public Worship, said, "The eagerness displayed by the Emperor to hasten the execution of the works is therefore an additional proof that he desires peace, and has no reason to believe in war. Yes, the Emperor desires peace—an honourable peace, worthy of a great nation. France, confiding in her own strength, is prepared for all eventualities. By the development of her military organization she does not seek war, and we are convinced that no one entertains any idea of declaring war against her. The peace of Europe will not be disturbed. Do not believe, therefore, in those cries of alarm, the talk of war, which either error or malevolence reproduces with a kind of periodicity, and devote yourselves in safety to the labours of agriculture and of industry."

During a debate on the question of Free Trade in the Corps

Législatif in May, M. de Forcade de la Roquette, Minister of Commerce, said in reply to a speech of M. Thiers, "It is advisable not to aggravate the difficulties of the present by denunciations of the past. On the other side the Rhine there are also persons who endeavour to provoke national susceptibilities by saying that Prussia has gained but Germany has lost by the evacuation of Luxemburg and of Mantua. Let history be the judge of these events, while we endeavour to insure peace by conciliation. As regards political traditions, England herself, despite her traditional policy, allowed the Hanoverian dynasty to fall. It is not by sowing resentment that we can put a stop to commercial crises. The Government will recover its freedom of action in 1870. It will not draw back, nor will it follow those who wish to advance too impatiently, but will maintain the tariffs in their present position. The Government and the Chamber will not be divided upon this question any more than upon any other. They were both elected by universal suffrage, and they will always devote themselves simultaneously, not to individual interests, as formerly, but to the general interests of the country."

And subsequently, with reference to the Commercial Treaty with England, M. Rouher said, "To those who ask that the Government should give notice of withdrawal from the Treaty of Commerce, we reply point blank—No! The Emperor has the constitutional right to conclude treaties of commerce, but the Government desire to have recourse for the future to the legislative powers when the question arises of reforming the Customs' tariff, only it is to be held firmly to the path of progress."

The Emperor was at Rouen at the end of May, and in reply to a speech addressed to him by the Cardinal of Rouen, said, "The Church is the sanctuary where the great principles of Christian morality are maintained intact, principles which elevate man above all material interests. Let us then join with the faith of our forefathers the sentiment of progress; let us never separate our love of God from the love of our country. Thus we shall render ourselves less unworthy of Divine protection, and be enabled to march with head erect in the path of duty through every obstacle."

The report on the Budget of 1869 was issued to the Chambers in the middle of June.

The ordinary receipts were set down at	F. 1,700,948,237
The expenses	1,622,484,651
	<hr/>
Surplus	78,463,586

which sum was to be imputed as assets for the extraordinary Budget¹.

¹ The supplementary credits for the ordinary Budget of 1868 amounted to sixty-one millions, of which forty-nine millions were for military expenses; and the supplementary

M. Busson Billault, the reporter, said in the document drawn up by him, "The expenses relative to the army and fleet occupy a large place; they are the consequences of events which have been accomplished, and of the progress which has been effected in the armament. France does not menace, but she fears no one. In imposing these sacrifices on herself, in giving a stronger organization to her military forces, she is not directed by any thought of aggression; she desires peace, which alone will permit her to develop her natural wealth. Her Government wishes it sincerely, and has not ceased to declare so, while every thing leads to the conviction that tranquillity will not be disturbed. The attitude and acts of the Government have dissipated many erroneous opinions, and we have received the formal affirmation that its relations with the various Powers of Europe are of a nature to inspire the same confidence. No serious and solid peace can exist for a great nation like France, unless her security and honour are fully safeguarded, and this is why she has raised her military organization and her defensive power to the level of other countries."

To balance, however, the whole expenses, a loan of 134,000,000*f.* was necessary, and this was granted, but not charged upon the Budget.

When the discussion on the Budget took place in the Corps Législatif, M. Rouher said, "The present strength of our army is the effective peace strength. In all circumstances, and in all countries, in Greece, in the Danubian Principalities, as much as in our relations towards Germany, we have always upheld the principle of the pacification and independence of nations. The improvement of our arms is but an indispensable guarantee against war. We have need to be ready for all eventualities, and it

credits for the extraordinary Budget of 1868 amounted to 109 millions, of which fifty-seven millions were for military and twenty-six for naval purposes. The excess of expenditure over revenue for 1868 was estimated at 128 millions.

In the ordinary Budget of 1869 the expenditure for military purposes is fixed at 381 millions, or thirty-three millions more than in 1868. In the extraordinary Budget the total expenditure amounts to 184 millions, of which thirty-seven millions are for military and twenty-one for naval purposes.

The amount of loans contracted by different towns and departments in France, exclusive of all State loans since 1852 is shown by the following statement:—

	F.
374 of the departments, total	154,132,854
541 city loans, authorized by laws	409,478,372
Loans during 1867	60,000,000
Communes with revenues under 100,000 <i>f.</i> , by simple decree	200,000,000
Loan called "de la Seine"	50,000,000
Paris (1852)	50,000,000
Paris (1855-60)	218,809,000
Paris (1865)	300,000,000
Bonds called "de Délégation"	454,000,000
Bonds of the Fund of Public Works (Paris)	120,000,000
Total	2,016,415,226

would be imprudent to leave a great nation like France exposed without the power of defending her honour and her flag, if their defence became necessary. The Government has no *arrière-pensée*. In its eyes, peace is the great condition of civilization, and war a great calamity. The Government is at one with the Opposition and with the majority in its desire for peace, but to wish for peace is not to conclude in favour of disarmament."

Marshal Niel said, "We have at present an army so strong that no Power in Europe could desire to wage war upon us, but we are weaker in artillery than the other Powers. The moral effect of artillery is superior to material effects. Therefore we must not compromise the moral effect by such a reduction as that proposed."

M. Jules Favre argued that France ought to take the initiative in a general disarmament.

The Marquis de Moustier replied. Referring to Crete, he said, "This question has passed through three phases—in the first we sought to prevent the Cretan insurrection, and any intervention by Greece; in the second, we endeavoured to prevent Turkey from concentrating her forces in the island, by showing her the crisis with which she would be threatened; and, in the third, we paved the way in a friendly manner for the introduction of improved institutions into Crete."

In reference to Germany, M. de Moustier stated that it was in the interest of peace that France had recourse to armaments, which had been, and would remain, an element of peace. If the Government had no despatches to lay on the table, it was because, in the interest of peace, it had abstained from every irritating controversy with Germany. The only despatch that had been written had been one in which the Government had explained the true nature of the interview at Salzburg. That interview concealed no warlike *arrière-pensée*. If the peaceful declarations of the Government, so frequently reiterated, had not succeeded in removing all uneasiness it was because they had been met by a perverse incredulity on the part of the Opposition.

M. Thiers asked whether it was true or not that during the last seventeen years the Government had been obliged to raise, over and above the proceeds of the taxes, a sum of 4,322,000,000*f*.

In the sitting of the Corps Législatif on the 10th of July, M. Ollivier called attention to the approaching meeting of an Œcumenical Council. He expressed his opinion that the State ought to throw no obstacles in the way of the publication in France of the Papal Bull convoking the Council or of the departure of the French bishops for Rome, but he thought it advisable for the Government to abstain from taking any part in the Council. In conclusion, he argued that the Government should prepare a law for the separation of Church and State. M. Baroche, Minister of Public Worship, in reply, stated that the Government observed a

double rule of conduct—namely, the Concordat and the principles of '89. It had not yet decided any thing with regard to the question whether France should be represented at the Ecumenical Council or not, and whether the decisions of the Council should be totally or partially admitted in France. With reference to the separation of Church and State, M. Baroche said it was necessary to leave time to solve this delicate question.

The Session of the Chambers was brought to a close on the 28th of July.

A vacancy occurred in the representation of the second division of the Jura, and a M. Grévy became the Opposition candidate. We mention the circumstance for the purpose of quoting a remarkable and prophetic speech made by him when he was a member of the Constituent Assembly in October, 1848, and asked the following questions, to which the course of events has given a significant answer:—"Are you sure that in this series of personages who are to succeed each other on the throne of the Presidency every four years, there never will be any but pure Republicans promptly descending from it at the expiration of their term of office? Are you sure that there never will be among them an ambitious man who may be tempted to prolong his power? And if that ambitious man happened to be one who has succeeded in making himself popular—if he be a victorious general invested with all the *prestige* of military glory, which the French people never can resist—if he be a scion of one of the families who have reigned in France, and has never formally renounced what he calls his rights—if commerce should be stagnant—if the people be in a state of suffering—and if in one of those moments of crisis when, through misery and deception, they give themselves up to those who hide under promises designs against liberty—will you affirm it as a certainty that this ambitious man shall not succeed in overthrowing the Republic?"

A curious incident happened in August, which shows how little feeling of attachment to the Napoleon dynasty really exists in France. At the distribution of prizes to the pupils of the University in the hall of Sorbonne, M. Duruy, the Minister of Public Instruction, presided, and he had by his side the young Prince Imperial. A son of General Cavaignac had gained one of the prizes, and he was called up by the Minister to receive it. He however hesitated, and then rose, but on a sign made to him by his mother resumed the seat which he had just quitted. There was a burst of applause for the reason was perfectly understood. The son of General Cavaignac did not choose to receive a prize at the hands of the son of the Emperor. It was a very ungracious act, but the way in which it was applauded by the students showed how little loyalty to the occupant of the throne exists in the hearts of the youth of France.

A new map of France was published by the Government in the

course of the autumn, the object of which was to show how much better her position relatively to the balance of power had become under the rule of Napoleon III. It was accompanied by a preface which said,—“Under the Second Empire France has regained her natural frontiers, the Alps. Italy has become a free country. Holland has burst the chains which bound her to the German Confederation in virtue of her possession of Limburg and Luxemburg. The German Confederation has been dissolved; the Federal fortresses have ceased to exist; Mayence is now occupied by Prussia alone. Landau and Germersheim belong to Bavaria, and are garrisoned by her; Rastadt is occupied by Baden troops, and Ulm by Bavaria and Wurtemberg together. Prussia is materially increased, but in reality the European balance of power is not destroyed to the detriment of France. Before the recent events Prussia and Austria united were the rulers of Germany, and they could oppose us with 80,000,000 of men, bound together by treaties and a formidable military organization. To-day the States surrounding France are independent; Belgium and Switzerland are neuter; Prussia, with the North German Confederation, counts 30,000,000; the South German States, having a military alliance with Prussia, count 8,000,000, Austria 35,000,000, and Italy 22,000,000. France, with her unity and her 40,000,000 of inhabitants, including Algeria, has nothing to fear from any one.”

A member of the Chamber of Deputies named Baudin was killed at a barricade, fighting on the side of the insurgents on the 3rd of December, 1851, the day after the *coup d'état*. He was buried in the cemetery of Montmartre, and the man and his grave had been forgotten until the latter happened to be discovered in November this year. It was determined by some strenuous opponents of the existing Government to erect a monument to his memory, and subscription-lists were opened which were soon filled by a great number of names. Instead of treating the matter with indifference, the Ministry unwisely gave it a political importance by prosecuting the journals in which the lists appeared. The charge was that they were guilty of “manœuvres with the object of disturbing the public peace, and exciting hatred and contempt against the Government of the Emperor;” and several of the editors were found guilty and sentenced to penalties. It would have been much better to follow the advice given by the journal *La France*, which observed,—“If the Republicans desire to raise a statue to the memory of Baudin, if they do so pacifically, honourably, without troubling public order, without outraging the Constitution and the laws, without provoking the people to revolt, we sincerely believe it is impolitic to prevent them.”

M. Berryer was among the number of subscribers, and he wrote the following letter to the editor of one of the newspapers:—

“Paris, Nov. 11.

“Sir,—On the 2nd of December I proposed and obtained from

the National Assembly, held in the Mairée, of the 10th arrondissement, a decree deposing and outlawing the President of the Republic, and I convoked the citizens to resist the violation of the laws of which the President was guilty. That decree was made as public as possible in Paris. My colleague, M. Baudin, energetically obeyed the orders of the Assembly. He was the victim of that obedience; and I feel myself bound to take part in the subscription opened for the erection of an expiatory monument on his tomb. Be pleased to accept my offering, and receive the expression, &c. BERRYER."

Soon afterwards this illustrious man—one of the greatest advocates who have ever adorned the bar of France—was seized by a sudden illness, and died at a good old age.

In December some changes took place in the French Ministry. M. Pinard retired from the office of Minister of the Interior, and was succeeded by M. Forcade de la Roquette, who was replaced by M. Grosner in the office of Public Works. The Marquis de Moustier left the Foreign Office, and was succeeded by M. de Lavalette.

CHAPTER II.

SPAIN—ITALY.

SPAIN—Dissatisfaction of the people—Death of Marshal Narvaez—New Cabinet under Gonzalez Bravo—Arrest and banishment of Spanish generals—Duke and Duchess de Montpensier ordered to leave Spain—Outbreak of the Revolution at Cadiz—Return of the banished generals—Proclamation of General Prim—Resignation of the Ministry—Defeat of the royal troops—Flight of the Queen from Spain—Manifestoes of the Provisional Government—Entry of Marshal Serrano into Madrid—Formation of a Provisional Ministry—Decrees—Recognition of the Provisional Government by Foreign Powers—New Electoral law—Manifesto of Electoral Committee—Disturbance at Cadiz.

ITALY—Changes in the Cabinet—Speech of General Menabrea—Circular of the Minister of the Interior on the condition of the Country.

SPAIN.

THIS year witnessed a revolution in Spain which overthrew the Bourbon dynasty and left the form of government to the choice of the people. Insurrectionary movements may be said to have been the chronic state of that country for many years past, but they have until the present year been all abortive; and so long as the army remained faithful to the throne there seemed to be no chance of their succeeding; but now the whole nation, including the military and the fleet, has risen and swept away one of the worst

Governments in Europe. The conduct of the Queen had alienated all feelings of loyalty, and the forms of the Constitution had been abused and made the machinery of arbitrary and oppressive rule. The people were weary of a system which repressed all freedom of thought and rights of conscience, which placed the education of the young in the hands of Jesuits, and under which they had lost all respect for their Ministers and all attachment to the Crown. Nothing, however, occurred until April to give warning of the coming storm. In that month insurrectionary movements broke out in Catalonia, and the province was placed in a state of siege. On the 23rd of April Marshal Narvaez, the President of the Council, died, and this led to a resignation of the Ministry. A new Cabinet was formed under Gonzalez Bravo, with SS. Roncali, Belda, Marfori, Orobio, Catalina, and Villaroya as his colleagues, and some other changes in the composition of the Ministry took place in June.

In July several Spanish generals were arrested and, without any form of trial, sent into exile. Marshal Serrano (Duke de la Torre), General Dominiquez, General Serrano (a relative of the Marshal), and General Dulce were put on board ship at Cadiz and sent off to the Canary Islands. Other generals were sent to the Balearic Islands, and some were confined in Spain. At the same time an intimation was conveyed to the Duke and Duchess de Montpensier to leave Spain, and as they refused to comply on the ground that an Infanta of Spain could receive orders only direct from the Sovereign, the Queen signed a decree exiling them from the country. They were sent on board a Spanish ship of war, the "Villa de Madrid," and conveyed to Lisbon. The Captain-General of Andalusia was ordered to accompany them to the ship, and it is said that the captain of the vessel, when he received them whispered to the Duke, "Say but the word, and the Captain-General shall remain as a prisoner on board, and we will sail to the Canaries to fetch the banished generals, and bring them back to Spain." But the Duke refused.

In September the revolution broke out. General Prim left England on the 11th of that month and reached Cadiz on the 17th. In the meantime a vessel had been sent by the revolutionary leaders to the Canary Islands to bring back the banished Generals, and they arrived at Cadiz on the 19th. The day before the Spanish fleet at that port, under the command of Admiral Topete, and the garrison in the city declared for the revolution.

A proclamation was issued signed by General Prim, in which he said :—

"People of Cadiz !

"Viva Liberty ! Viva the sovereignty of the nation !

"Yesterday you were groaning under the yoke of a despotic Government. To-day the flag of liberty waves over your walls.

"The squadron of the fleet led by Admiral Topete, in the first instance, and subsequently the garrison and the populace, have

proclaimed the revolution, and Cadiz is now in arms. That city which was the cradle of our liberties, the shelter of the defenders of our independence, and the last asylum of those who protested against foreign invasion, has set an example which the whole province has imitated, and which to-morrow will be followed by every good Spaniard.

"City of the year '12, of '20, and of '23! City of Muñoz Tonero, of Riego, and of Arguëlles, I congratulate you on having taken the first step and on your resolute conduct. The fleet, the garrison, and the people of Cadiz will solve the revolutionary problem. Each day we shall hear of the rising of a town; each day of the mutiny of a garrison.

"Until the moment arrives when Spain, freely convoked, shall decide upon her destinies, it is incumbent upon us to organize ourselves to carry on the struggle and to save the people from being bereft of all law and authority.

"For this reason I have felt obliged to choose a Provisional Junta which will attend to the services which are most urgent; which will carry on the administration of the neighbourhood; which will organize the province in concert with the other Juntas of the district. The Junta which is to govern us is composed of men grown grey in the service of liberty; of youths full of faith and enthusiasm for the ideas which constitute modern civilization; of independent citizens who have given every species of aid to the revolution during the most critical moments; of representatives, in short, of all shades of liberal opinion and local affections. Admiral Topete will preside; his name alone, apart from the respectability and deserts of the other members of the Junta, is a guarantee of success.

"If any slight feeling of resentment should exist towards any of the members of the committee, I beseech of you to forget it. If the least prejudice should exist, I entreat you to let it disappear. Let us carry out the revolutionary movement; let us awake the enthusiasm, yet preserve the tranquillity, of the towns; and let it be reserved for universal suffrage in the first instance, and then for *Cortes Constituyentes* to decide upon our destinies.

"To-day we are all good citizens. To-morrow we shall be good and worthy citizens, respecting the supremacy of the sovereignty of the nation."

Marshal Serrano, Duke de la Torre, formerly President of the Senate, placed himself at the head of the movement, and the whole of Andalusia pronounced for the revolution. The Spanish Ministry resigned, and General Concha was appointed by the Queen President of the Council.

The Marquis de Novaliches commanded the royal army, and he marched upon Cordova, which was occupied by the insurgents.

At Burgos a severe conflict took place, which ended in the royal troops fraternizing with the people. Juntas were established in the different towns, which one after another rapidly hoisted the

flag of rebellion. At Seville General Prim issued the following proclamation :—

“Spaniards! You cannot resign yourselves any longer to the present state of things without becoming degraded. The hour of revolution has struck. The Government by persisting in its evil course has, unfortunately, rendered tardy concessions impossible. Let us avoid coming prematurely to a decision upon the questions before us, which circumstances and events might render impossible of realization, and which might prejudice the judgment of the people.”

Before the end of September the Marquis de Novaliches had reached the bridge of Alcolea on the Guadalquivir, about fifteen miles from Cordova. Here an engagement took place between the royal troops and the insurgents under General Serrano, in which the former were defeated, and the Marquis de Novaliches received a wound of which he died two days afterwards. This was the last serious attempt to stop the progress of the revolution. The Queen fled from Spain and took refuge in France, arriving at Biarritz on the 30th of September. She there had a short interview with the Emperor Napoleon, and then went to Bayonne.

On the 20th of October the Provisional Government issued a manifesto to the nation, in which, after explaining the reason which impelled the people to rise against the Bourbon dynasty, they said, “The people must now regain the time which it has lost. The principle of popular sovereignty which is now naturalized in Spain is the principle of national life, and the ideal type of the nation’s aspirations. We may therefore be permitted to affirm that the national sovereignty, exercised in the first place by the vote of all, and subsequently by those elected by the people, will decree a complete system of liberties, which form, or will form, soon the rich and inalienable patrimony of a civilized country.” •

The proclamation stated the desire of the Government to be on good terms with foreign Powers, and to obtain the moral concurrence of foreign Governments, adding, “But if we should fail in this respect, if the example of America in recognizing the revolution be not followed, we shall not be discouraged. We can tranquilly proceed with our task, for our independence is not threatened, and we have no foreign intervention to fear.

“To legitimize the revolution we have sought the sole criterion now considered infallible—namely, an appeal to universal suffrage. The aim which we have in view is to place ourselves on a level with the most advanced nations, and thus cease to form a dissonance in the great concert of nations.

“We have a perfect right to expect from foreign countries respect for the state of things which we have created, and we entertain a justifiable hope that the Governments which march at the head of civilization will not refuse to Spain those proofs of

amity and fraternity which they accorded to the power that crushed and humiliated us."

In another manifesto they said, "Spain can quietly proceed to finally choose a form of government. Without pretending to prejudice such serious and complicated questions, the Provisional Government notices as very significant the silence maintained by the Juntas respecting monarchical institutions. Yet eloquent and authoritative voices have been raised in defence of the Republican system. But however important may have been the opinions they have expressed, they are not so important as the universal reserve of the Juntas on this delicate question. Nevertheless, if the Provisional Government be mistaken, if the popular decision should be against a monarchy, the Provisional Government will respect the will of the national sovereignty."

Marshal Serrano entered Madrid at the head of the revolutionary troops on the 3rd of October, and was received with the utmost enthusiasm by the inhabitants. He addressed the people and told them that he had telegraphed to General Espartero, placing himself over the other generals under his orders. He was, however, authorized by the Central Junta of the Capital to exercise supreme power and appoint a Ministry until a Constituent Assembly should meet. He accepted the office, and said in a speech addressed to the people, "Let tranquillity continue to prevail, and do not allow your confidence in the issue of our efforts to diminish. Thus the revolution will continue to afford a magnificent spectacle, which is the admiration of Europe. The unity and discipline of the army, its fraternization with the people, and the patriotism of all will accomplish the work of the revolution, avoiding equally the impulse of reaction and the discredit of disorder."

A Provisional Ministry was formed, and they issued a circular, in which they said, "The Government has taken in hand the reins of the State in order to lead the nation to liberty, and not allow it to perish in anarchy."

An indignant protest having been issued by the Queen from her asylum in France, the *Madrid Gazette* published it with the following comment:—"Queen Isabella has addressed a manifesto to the Spaniards. The Junta refrains from making any criticism upon it. The nation have passed their sovereign judgment on the acts of the Queen, and can now pass their verdict on her words."

The Minister of Justice issued a decree suppressing the Society of the Jesuits throughout Spain and the Spanish islands, ordering that its colleges and institutions be closed within three days, and declaring its movable and immovable property sequestered to the State.

A decree was also published that henceforward primary education shall be absolutely free, restoring the normal schools, and re-appointing the professors removed by the late Government.

Another decree proclaimed the absolute liberty of the press, and suppressed the censorship on literary and dramatic publications.

On the 25th of October the representatives of Great Britain, France, Prussia, and Portugal delivered despatches to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, recognizing the Provisional Government on behalf of their respective Governments.

General Prim was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the army, and he issued a circular prohibiting soldiers from taking part, whether collectively or individually, in associations or meetings in any way public which are intended to express a political idea or object.

An electoral law was promulgated by the Government, by which every citizen of twenty-five years of age who was not deprived of his political rights was entitled to vote for the election of town councillors, provincial deputies, and deputies to the Constituent Cortes. The general elections were to be by provinces. Provinces where not more than six deputies were to be elected would be divided into two circumscriptions; where over six and not more than ten were to be elected, into three circumscriptions; and where there were more than ten deputies the province was to be divided into electoral districts of 45,000 inhabitants.

An Electoral Committee was formed, and it issued a manifesto in which it thus spoke of the future form of Government:—

“The monarchical form is imposed upon us by the exigencies of the revolution and the necessity of consolidating the liberties we have acquired. Monarchy by Divine right is for ever dead. Our future monarchy, in deriving its origin from popular rights, will be a consecration of universal suffrage. It will symbolize the national sovereignty, and consolidate public liberty, the right of the people being superior to all institutions and powers. This monarchy, surrounded by democratic institutions, cannot fail to be popular.”

But who was to be the King? This was the great difficulty, even if the nation by a *plébiscite* declared in favour of monarchy. The votes had not been taken before the close of the present year, and our next volume will give the result on which hangs the destiny of Spain.

In December some serious fighting took place at Cadiz, where the people declared for a Republic, and organized a Militia, who styled themselves “Volunteers of Freedom.” They refused to disarm, and after a contest in the streets, Government troops marched upon the town from Madrid, and General Caballero de Roda, who commanded them, addressed a proclamation to the inhabitants, in which he said;—

“A revolution, incited and fomented by secret enemies, is deluging with blood the streets of your beautiful city, but has found no echo in the Peninsula, and I come to suppress it with the forces placed at my disposal by the Government. Lay down your arms, and your lives will be saved. This I guarantee you in the name of the Government, on whose clemency you may rely. Such is

the only means by which the insurgents can escape being treated with inflexible rigour.

"I grant you a delay until to-morrow at noon, in order that the old men, women, and children, as well as all peaceably disposed citizens, may leave the town.

"Inhabitants of Cadiz!

"It will not be my fault if, with the means of attack which the imperious law of necessity compels me to employ, there should come for Cadiz a day of mourning and ruin. I shall regret such a result from the bottom of my heart, but shall do my duty."

The result was that the town surrendered, and the Government troops took peaceable possession of it.

ITALY.

Some changes took place in the Menabrea Cabinet at the beginning of the year, when Signors Cardona, de Filippé, and Ribotti became respectively Ministers of the Interior, Justice, and Marine. In announcing this to the Chamber of Deputies, General Menabrea said, "The country desires nothing so much as accord between the Parliament and the Government, which would promptly effect a restoration of the public administration, and strengthen the principle of order and authority. We appeal for concord and conciliation to obtain the fulfilment of these legitimate wishes. A series of Bills will be laid before Parliament, the principal object of which will be to introduce great economy and order into all branches of the public administration. These measures include Bills upon the conditions of Government functionaries, on the collection of taxes, and on the present system of public accounts. I earnestly recommend voting the Budget of 1868, otherwise the public administration of the law, and the fundamental basis of well-ordered Governmental administration will be endangered. Our duty is no light one. The peril which menaces Italy is not yet removed. Great financial danger is still imminent. Recent events have also emboldened the reactionary party to conceive impossible schemes for the division of Italy. Let us all therefore rally round the flag of the Monarchy, of duty, and of liberty. Let us work harmoniously to avert peril. Relying upon faith in our right, strong in the experience we have acquired by dangers past, we shall be able to overcome the present peril, and attain the object desired by all to secure independence, greatness, and liberty for Italy."

In a circular issued by the Minister of the Interior to the prefects on the internal condition of the country, he said, "The first essential condition for the liberty of all is respect for and observance of the law. This object cannot be attained when the Government, being scrupulously bound to enforce them, does not

the necessary energy and authority. In a State where it would be possible for few or for many to impose obstacles or exercise influences detrimental to the execution of the law, by placing themselves above it and above Parliament and the Government, there would be only liberty for the few to deprive of liberty all the others. It would be the negation of the Constitution and of all liberty, and would tend directly to absolutism or anarchy. Italy did not accomplish her great and pacific revolution to perpetuate revolution, or to reap such fruit from it. She wishes to cement and render fruitful her precious conquests. She requires security and tranquillity to be able to develop that internal activity which alone can make her powerful, happy, and respected. She is justly proud and jealous of her unity and her liberty, but on that very account she demands that the Government, while keeping within the bounds of the strictest legality, shall make itself be respected by all, that it shall employ no illegal influence, and prove by facts that it has a resolute will, authority, and power to govern and strengthen its action. To attain this object it is only necessary that the existing laws should be carried out. On this sole condition can the liberty of all be assured and guaranteed, nor can the unity of Italy otherwise obtain that culmination to which the country unanimously aspires. In conclusion, the Minister confidently relies upon the support of the prefects, and believes that his antecedents in public life will secure their cordial co-operation. He alludes to his former efforts in Parliament to promote administrative decentralization, and to increase the sphere of action and the authority of the prefects. The Government will efficaciously support the prefects in maintaining the respect for the law and moral principles."

Nothing of general political importance took place this year in Italy, and the internal history presents no features which would interest the reader.

CHAPTER III.

PRUSSIA—AUSTRIA—DENMARK—SERVIA—GREECE.

PRUSSIA—Speech of the King at the opening of the Reichstag of North Germany—Royal Speech at the prorogation of the Prussian Chambers—Opening of the Chambers in November—Speech of Count Bismarck with regard to Baron Beust.

AUSTRIA—Red Book on the policy of the Empire—Abolition of the Concordat—Baron Beust and Lord Stanley—Speech of Baron Beust on the Foreign Policy of Austria—The Emperor's address to the Army—New titles of the Emperor—Speech of the Emperor at the close of the Session of the Hungarian Diet—"Explosive Bullet" Treaty between the European Powers.

DENMARK—Speech of the King on the question of North Schleswig.

SERVIA—Assassination of Prince Michael—Prince Milan elected his successor—Trial and conviction of the regicides.

GREECE—Speech of the King relative to the Cretan insurrection—Connivance of the Greek Government—*Ultimatum* of Turkey—Blockade running—Proposed Conference.

PRUSSIA.

THE Reichstag or Parliament of North Germany was opened by the King of Prussia on the 22nd of March, when he delivered the following speech:—

“Honourable Gentlemen,—For the third time I bid you welcome in the name of the Government of the Confederation, in order that it may continue in concert with you the settlement of the Constitution for the North German Confederation. In your last Session, by the establishment of organic institutions, you fixed the bases upon which the legislation of the Confederation must raise the edifice of national institutions.

“For this purpose three Bills, which must be submitted for your decision, have been presented to the Federal Council, and have been already partially discussed.

“In the last Session the principle of freedom of domicile was established. The readiness with which you have received and discussed the propositions which have hitherto been laid before you affords a good augury for your reception of these fresh measures.

“A plan will be brought before you with a view to settle the position of the former officers of Schleswig-Holstein, who last Session appealed to your benevolence, and to fix the amount of assistance to be given to the necessitous soldiers of the reserve.

“The duties upon brandy in the Hohenzollern Duchies and in that part of Hesse which belongs to the Confederation require to be settled, and such settlement is connected with a treaty by virtue of which free transit must be stipulated for beer and brandy between the Confederation and that part of Hesse not included within the Federal territory.

“The Budget for the year 1869 will be presented to you, notwithstanding the difficulties which presented themselves in the beginning of the year to its definitive arrangement. Nothing has been neglected to forward this work in order that, as usual, you might be summoned at a period when the least sacrifices would be imposed upon you. The organization of the international postal service upon the basis of the laws passed last Session is already in an advanced stage. Postal conventions have been concluded with the South German States, with Austria, Luxemburg, Norway, and the United States of America, and will be presented to you. Similar conventions with other States are on the eve of conclusion, and may, I trust, also be submitted to you during the present Session. A treaty has been concluded with the United States of America to define the nationality of emigrants from the two countries, and thus to prevent causes of misunderstanding between countries so closely united by commercial interests and bonds of relationship. In concert with the confederated Governments, and upon the

occasion of negotiations relative to these treaties, I have given in all arrangements connected with the subject further extension of the principle of industrial freedom. Thus the suppression of police restrictions which obstructed marriages has disposed of an obstacle which more than any other was injurious to the development of industrial efforts.

"A law concerning the obligation of furnishing lodgings to soldiers in time of peace will have the effect of completing the military legislation of the Confederation in a point of view particularly important for the interests of the people.

"The regulation of weights and measures, which last Session had to yield to more urgent subjects, will be considered in the present Session. The position of Federal functionaries requires legal regulation, and will form the subject of special Bills. A Bill affecting the administration of the debts of the Confederation will be again presented to you.

"I have confidence in the readiness with which the Federal Governments have accepted the position assigned to them in the Confederation. The diplomatic representation of the Confederation prescribed by the Constitution is now an accomplished fact, to my great satisfaction. This fact has consolidated the friendly relations which exist between the Confederation and foreign Powers. The object of my constant solicitude will be to foster and to maintain these relations. I am able, therefore, to express a conviction that peace will bless the efforts which you are making for the prosperity of the national interests, for the protection and maintenance of which interests the whole German country is united."

On the prorogation of the Prussian Chambers the King delivered the following speech:—

"The Parliamentary Session which concludes to-day has been fruitful of important problems. Like myself, you will be satisfied to know that these problems have been solved, or are on the eve of being solved, thanks to the accord existing upon essential points between my Government and the representatives of the country. I thank you for the readiness with which the two Chambers of Parliament have voted the augmentation of the Civil List which I had demanded with the object of maintaining the dignity of the Crown. The vote of the Budget and those of other financial measures which you have adopted, have furnished my Government with all the resources necessary for the administration of the enlarged monarchy and for the satisfaction of the legitimate desires and wants of the recently-annexed provinces. My Government will feel bound to employ those resources with economy and circumspection. The measures which, with your consent, have been taken to relieve the distress in Eastern Prussia, added to the resources furnished by private benevolence from all quarters, and to the experienced care of the authorities, will, I confidently hope, be sufficient to avert the most immediate dangers from their cruelly-tryed province. Ulterior measures, which will be adopted with

your agreement, will contribute to bring those districts into more close connexion with the general intercourse of all parts of the monarchy, and to further the development of their prosperity. You have adopted a series of important measures—some affecting the general interests of the country, and others special interests of the provinces. With regard to the development of administrative institutions, which it is my object to further, you have been able during this Session to enter upon but preliminary discussions. The views and desires which have been expressed upon this subject will be carefully considered in the course of the labours preparatory to legislation now in progress. In voting the provincial fund for Hanover you have not only assented to the spirit of equity and good-will which governs my resolutions in respect of the new provinces, but you have at the same time taken up ground from which it is the intention of my Government to obtain for the other provinces the benefits of successful self-administration. I recognize with satisfaction that you have adopted the political views and considerations which influenced my Government in concluding treaties of indemnity with the former Sovereigns of Hanover and Nassau. By that course you have contributed towards the solid establishment of the new relations, and to secure their calm and peaceful development. In its foreign relations my Government has incessantly endeavoured to exert its influence for the preservation and consolidation of the peace of Europe, and I am able to state with satisfaction that those endeavours, inasmuch as they were participated in by the Governments of foreign Powers in the most friendly and conciliatory manner, bore in themselves the guarantee of success. I may therefore express the conviction that the firmly-based general confidence in the development of mental and material welfare and the prosperity of the nation will bear the desired fruits."

The Prussian Diet was opened on the 4th of November by the King, who delivered the following speech from the throne:—

"The Session which begins to-day opens for you a new field of important legislative labour. I trust that the same spirit of ready co-operation with my Government to which the favourable results of the last Sessions were due will rule over your deliberations on this occasion.

"The Budget for next year will be laid before you without delay. In consequence of the concurrence of several unfavourable circumstances it has been necessary to draw upon the extraordinary revenue in order to completely cover the expenditure, although the latter has been curtailed as much as possible. The continued badness of trade, and the consequences of the unfavourable harvest of the previous year have prevented the otherwise naturally increasing revenue from keeping pace with the unavoidable increase of the requirements of the State. The reductions of the Customs duties and other sources of revenue, which were resolved upon in the general politico-economical interest of the country, have occasioned a falling off of the receipts to a considerable extent. In the

expectation of this, Bills were at the beginning of the year brought before the Customs Parliament, which did not, however, give them its approval.

"I confidently hope that the necessity of an addition to the special revenue of the Confederation will be acknowledged, and that this addition will no longer be refused. Inasmuch as according to the present state of things a revival of trade and its favourable influence in increasing the State revenue may be expected, we may deduce therefrom the hope that means will shortly be available for restoring the equilibrium between the ordinary revenue and ordinary expenditure, and that we shall be able to provide more liberally for the expenses of the State than is at present possible.

"In considering these circumstances you will not hesitate to give your sanction to the proposals of my Government for meeting the required expenditure for next year.

"The improvement of our administrative institutions has been the subject of searching examination. It cannot be intended to shake or abolish those hitherto existing institutions to which Prussia owes her prosperity before other institutions which promise to endure and be fruitful of results shall have been created. But, looking at the increased extent of the monarchy, and having regard to a desire which has in many ways been manifested, my Government recognizes as its duty gradually to hand over to the respective provincial and communal corporations, for independent consideration, those branches of public business which do not on account of any direct interest of the State necessarily require to be retained under the direction and care of the State authorities. So soon as those corporations are provided with proper administrative organizations, legislation will be directed towards extending their field of operation in the separate branches of public affairs accordingly as the experiments made shall show such extension to be advisable. In several of the new provinces the way is already paved for establishing these administrative organizations. To prepare the ground in the old provinces the completion of the system of dividing the country into districts is, above all, requisite. My Government will lay before you a Bill aiming at that object.

"It is intended to effect a number of other important amendments to the laws through your co-operation. The regulations respecting the acquisition or loss of the character of Prussian subjects require modification as affected by the establishment of the North German Confederation. With reference to the settlement of the communal relations in the province of Schleswig-Holstein, Bills will come before you treating of the Constitution and administration of the towns and district communes.

"My Government devotes unceasing care to the development of the popular schools, and confidently expects your approval of the Bills which relate to the position of those schools and their teachers.

"Your attention will be claimed in a special degree to the improvement of the administration of justice, and to a project for a complete identical code for the whole monarchy.

"Bills will also be presented to you relative to superior law appointments and law examinations, relative to expropriation, and also a Bill for introducing modifications, urgently desired by the commercial world, in the bankruptcy laws.

"Moreover, proposals will come before you for reforming the mortgage laws; and a general game law, to obtain throughout the whole monarchy, has been drawn up.

"By the conclusion of a revised Rhine Navigation Act, a new international agreement has been obtained for the traffic upon one of the most important of rivers. My Government will lay this convention before you for approval, in accordance with the Constitution.

"It affords me satisfaction that a return of the distress which afflicted a portion of the province of Prussia last year need not be apprehended this winter—a result due to the measures which were taken with your approval, to the devoted activity of the authorities and corporations, and to this year's favourable harvest in every province of the monarchy.

"The relations of my Government with foreign Powers in every direction are satisfactory and friendly. The events in the Western Peninsula of Europe can give rise to no other feeling within us than the wish and confidence that the Spanish nation will succeed in finding in the independent formation of her national position a guarantee of her future prosperity and power.

"A proof of united progress in civilization and humanity has been afforded by the International Congress, which has just accomplished at Geneva the task of completing and extending to the navies the principles already settled previously for treating and caring for the wounded in war. We may hope that the moment is far distant which will call for the application of these principles. The sentiments of the Sovereigns of Europe, and the nations' desire for peace, give ground for trusting that the advancing development of the general welfare will not only suffer no material disturbance, but will also be freed from those obstructing and paralyzing effects which have only too often been created by groundless fears taken advantage of by the enemies of peace and public order.

"Let the Diet proceed to its work of peace penetrated with this confidence."

In a speech delivered by Count Bismarck in December, he made the following remarks in answer to a bitter attack made by one of the deputies upon Baron Beust, the Austrian Minister:—"It is absolutely impossible for me to defend a foreign Minister without dilating on the policy of the State he serves, a task I do not feel called upon to perform at this moment, with regard to the Chancellor of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Still, I may observe that I am ignorant of the existence of personal hostility to myself or this Government in—if I may call him so—my Austrian col-

league. In former years I was on a friendly footing with him, and have no reason to suppose that a change has occurred. I should therefore deem myself bound to vindicate his conduct against what has fallen from a preceding speaker, had I not reasons for wishing to steer clear of the quicksands of international policy in to-day's debate. As to Austria's Liberalism, it consists in an army of 800,000, demanded and voted for a period of ten years, and some municipal arrangements introduced in Prussia fifty years ago. Even these Count Beust has taken care to render innocuous by a vigorous supervision on the part of the administrative authorities. *Au reste*, there is this similarity between Liberal Governments and the reigning beauties of the season, that the last out generally carries the day."

AUSTRIA.

A document called the Red Book was issued by the Austrian Government in February which gave a view of the political relations of the Empire with other States. With respect to the policy of Austria herself they said, "Austria, having by great sacrifices extricated herself from the events of 1866, is firmly resolved to follow both at home and abroad the policy of peace and conciliation as the only salutary one for the present as well as the future. His Majesty the Emperor-King, as well as the people of the Empire, are conscious that the war which Austria was forced to fight against two powerful enemies was neither unjust nor inglorious. But this thought is free from all idea of retaliation, and since the Peace of Prague, Austria, with respect both to Prussia and Italy, has the same pacific and friendly sentiments which she manifests with respect to the other Powers."

With respect to Germany and Italy,—"Austria entertains, since the treaty of Prague, the same peaceful and friendly sentiments towards Prussia and Italy as towards the other Powers. Though Austria's loss of her position in Germany did not imply the extinction of her sympathies towards her former Federal allies, she nevertheless would not side with Prussia in the Luxemburg difficulty. On the other hand she would not attempt to profit by a war between France and Prussia, and the Imperial Government, therefore, took care to prevent the Emperor Napoleon and the French statesmen from expecting the co-operation of Austria in a conflict with Prussia. Impartial and neutral, Austria's attitude must have greatly contributed towards the preservation of peace. In any further proffer of its good offices the Imperial Government was compelled to act with the greatest prudence, as it desired neither to exercise any pressure upon Prussia to induce her to sacrifice German national interests, nor did it wish to lay itself open to the suspicion of confirming Prussia in her resistance with the view of bringing about a conflict. . . . Without departing from the standpoint of the treaty of Prague, the Imperial Government

did not allow itself to be delayed in the pursuit of its peaceful occupations by the new state of things which had been brought about through the treaties of alliance between Prussia and South Germany, nor did the Government of the Emperor think it necessary to enter a decided protest against this state of things on the ground of its formal rights. On the contrary, it looked upon the treaties relative to the reorganization of the South German armies and the Parliamentary representation of the States of the Zollverein with no other feelings than good wishes and reserve, although those treaties limited in important respects the rights of the South German States to act independently, and subordinated their decisions to those of the Prussian Government. The Emperor's Government has regarded from an equally conciliatory point of view the question of North Schleswig, in regard to which the Treaty of Prague, in the 5th Article, bears traces of the mediation of France. The provision of the treaty referred to has not yet been carried out. Lastly, there is one fact which cannot be overlooked—namely, that while under the impression of the danger of an European war many an anxious glance was directed both from Berlin and Munich towards Austria, the intimations which were received respecting a new alliance were too vague and too exclusively favouring the interests of one side, for Austria to sacrifice for it the freedom of action she obtained in exchange for the rights and duties cancelled at the termination of the era which closed with a dissolution of the German Confederation."

With regard to the relations of Austria towards Italy and the Roman question, the Red Book stated, "As Austria has attached great value to the maintenance of friendly relations with Italy, so also has Italy shown herself equally well disposed towards Austria. The withdrawal of the French army of occupation from Rome aroused dormant passions, and manifested the full danger of the conflict between the Italian claims to unity and the interests of Catholicity. The most open declarations were made to the Pope of the impossibility of Austria's affording the Holy See any material support. The despatch of Austrian corvettes to Civita Vecchia in November, 1866, for the protection of Austrian subjects was at first regarded by France as a sign of mistrust. Mutual declarations which followed between Austria and France removed all doubts of the latter's firm determination to insist upon the execution of the September Convention. The apprehensions of Roman diplomatists induced Austria in March, 1867, to request information from the French Government respecting the then threatening eventualities in connexion with the Roman question. At that time the extent of the danger was doubted in Paris. . . . The Imperial Government, appreciating the just desire of France to lessen her responsibility, by submitting the Roman question to the united consideration of all the European powers, accepted not only the invitation to a Conference without any distinct programme, but also a proposal proceeding from another quarter for a preliminary

Conference of the five great Powers. The Austrian Government awaits the realization of this proposal."

On the 25th of May new laws which had been passed on the subject of marriage and education, withdrawing these both from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, received the sanction of the Emperor. By these laws the Concordat was virtually abolished, and religious freedom was established in Austria. Marriage was made matter of civil contract, and schools were thrown open to all without distinction of creed. It was a great step in advance, and the death-blow of priestly domination.

At the end of October, Baron Beust having in his speech on the Army Budget represented the political situation of Europe as rather critical, he was reminded that Lord Stanley, the English Foreign Minister, had a short time before spoken of it in more favourable terms, upon which he said, "My position differs materially from that of the English Secretary of State. Lord Stanley is the Minister of a country surrounded and protected by the sea: I have the honour of directing the affairs of a State which has every reason to beware of its neighbours. We should, of course, be glad to be on friendly terms with Prussia, and are even endeavouring to improve our relations with the St. Petersburg Cabinet; but, as I said, we must be on our guard, though there is nothing to excite our immediate fears."

Afterwards there appeared in the *Vienna Presse*, a semi-official journal of the Austrian Government, the following remarks:—"That Austria's military preparations are merely defensive must be plain to any one that is not wilfully blind. To assume the contrary is simply to offend against common sense, or to enact over again the old story of the lamb and the wolf. But of course we owe it to our own interests not to allow ourselves to be netted and bagged. Our rival is showing an unmistakable intention of reviving the Oriental question to enable him to cross the Maine. It is this policy which encourages Russia to assume a haughty and menacing attitude towards Western Europe, and which is evidently intent on encompassing Austria with flames of revolutionary fire, from the Red Tower Pass to the Alps—from the River Save to the Bocca di Cattaro."

In October Baron Beust made a speech, justifying the necessity of maintaining the Austrian army on the war footing of 800,000 men. He is reported to have said, "Austria maintains the best relations with France and England, and is also upon the most friendly footing with Italy. The latter Power, however, has not always complete freedom of action. Austria remains unchanged in her resolve to abandon all policy of revenge against Prussia. With Russia Austria also seeks to maintain friendly relations. In view, however of the possibility of a conflict between France and Prussia, Austria is obliged to remain armed, as much to cause her own neutrality to be respected as to keep back other Powers who might be inclined to attack."

In November the Emperor addressed a letter to Baron Beust, in which he ordered that henceforth the title of the Emperor in treaties with foreign Powers should be Emperor of Austria, King of Bohemia, &c., and Apostolic King of Hungary; in the text of these treaties the abbreviated form, Emperor of Austria and Apostolic King of Hungary was to be used, and his Majesty would then be spoken of as his Majesty the Emperor and King, or his Imperial and Royal Apostolic Majesty.

It was further ordered that the whole of the royal and other provinces should be designated as the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy or the Austro-Hungarian State.

In an address to the army on the 8th of December the Emperor Francis Joseph said, "The Monarchy wants peace; we must know how to maintain it. For this purpose I have had presented to both Legislatures a Bill by which, in case of necessity, the whole population may rise in arms to defend the dearest interests of the country. Both Legislatures have passed it, and I have sanctioned it.

"The reorganization of the Empire has been effected on those historical bases on which it reposed in the times when it fought out the most difficult wars successfully.

"Both sides of my Empire will have henceforth the same interests in defending its security and power.

"My army thereby gains an auxiliary which will support it in good and ill fortune.

"My people, without distinction of class, will now, according to the law, rank under my colours proudly. Let the army be the school of that courage without which empires cannot maintain themselves.

"Side by side with the army will be a new element, the Honveds, to help in the common defence. Its aim is the same, and it is composed of the same elements, nay, partly issues from the army itself.

"I turn with confidence to the army.

"It is my will that those who serve the country in arms should do so with pleasure. It is my will that the loyalty and comradeship—that dear inheritance of the army—should animate all its parts, and that army, navy, and Honveds should hold together, like good comrades, animated by the same duties, and called to the same glory.

"I therefore confidently trust that all officers of the army and of the Honveds will receive this new institution in this spirit; particularly I expect that the Generals, as leaders, will draw closely the links which unite the two; that they will keep up the spirit of order and discipline, and stop from the beginning any false directions which may be taken.

"My army has gone through hard trials, but its courage is not broken, and my faith in it is not shaken.

"The path of honour and loyalty on which the brave sons of my

Empire have followed hitherto may be their path henceforth too. Let them be faithful to their past, and bring with them the glorious traditions of former times.

"Progressing in science and in the spirit of the times, strengthened by new elements, it will inspire respect to the enemy and be a stronghold of Throne and Empire."

The Emperor, as King of Hungary, brought the Session of the Hungarian Diet to a close on the 10th of December, when he delivered a speech, in which he said, "Gentlemen, my Lords, and Representatives,—The present Legislature ceases to-day, and we wished to close in person the Diet whose fruitful activity stands unparalleled in the long history of Hungary.

"We called you together three years ago, under difficult and anxious circumstances, to accomplish a great task.

"Our common aim and endeavour has been to solve all those questions which, not only in these last times, but for centuries, have been the sources of distrust and of collisions.

"Although prejudices inherited from times past, the power of habit, suspicions nourished by events, and the seeming antagonism of interests, contributed to complicate the situation, we have succeeded, nevertheless, in accomplishing our difficult task successfully.

"This success is owing to the loyal alliance between the King and the nation.

"To this Diet belongs the glory of having put an end to the political uncertainty which has benumbed the noblest forces of the nation.

"Mutual friendship and esteem have taken the place of the political struggles between the two States of our Monarchy.

"Both States of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, by means of their Constitutional and Parliamentary Government, arrange their own affairs independently; while in those important questions which concern the common affairs of the Monarchy, as stipulated by mutual consent, each of them exercises in the same measure its constitutional influence. The Monarchy, having sought and found its centre of gravity within itself, progresses with renewed vigour on the new path, the goal of which is peace and prosperity as well as the maintenance of that position which the Monarchy is called upon to occupy among the States of Europe.

"Thus the source from which came the evils of the past is stopped, and over it Hungarian loyalty, patriotism, and moderation have raised a lasting monument, on which history has already inscribed a long list of great and salutary achievements.

"Having been solemnly crowned with the crown of St. Stephen, inherited from my ancestors, the Hungarian Constitution has become a full reality; we have re-established the ancient honour and weight of the title of the King of Hungary, and we feel that by this our empire has not only not been weakened, but, on the contrary, has only regained its old basis and strength.

"We have therefore adopted with regard to foreign countries a title for our empire which is in conformity with the laws and the facts.

"A political compromise on the basis of equity and of common interests has been effected with Croatia and Slavonia, which renews the link which has existed for centuries in weal and woe between the two sister nations. We hope confidently that this alliance will unite again in devotion to my house and to the common country the Hungarian and Croatian nations for centuries to come.

"The union of Hungary and Transylvania has become an accomplished fact.

"Thus the integrity of the empire of St. Stephen has been restored in a way in which it has not existed for the last three hundred years.

"One of the guarantees of the integrity both of the Hungarian Crown and of our empire, is the new army organization. Moved by confidence, and judging with deep wisdom, you have recognized the necessity of a common army, and thus the defensive force which is to protect the development of the Monarchy has been created.

"You have promoted the intellectual welfare of the nation in passing such a law on education that, if it requires sacrifices from single special interests, it inaugurates, at the same time, a system of education which will serve as a support to material and intellectual progress.

"You have extended the civil and political rights which the citizens belonging to the different races had already enjoyed, to the use of their language likewise, granting all those wishes which are not in opposition to the law and good government.

"We hope that our non-Hungarian subjects will find tranquillity in the conviction that the Constitution insures to every citizen equal freedom and the development of his mother tongue.

"You have followed the principle of equality of rights in extending political rights to the Israelites, who until now knew only the charges, and not the advantages of the Constitution.

"You have regulated the relations of the different confessions on the basis of civil and religious equality.

"Not waiting for the Constitutional discussion of the law reforms, which demand considerable time, you have by the new regulation of judicial procedure facilitated the prompt administration of justice and the consolidation of private credit. . . .

"The progress of Hungary in the field of material prosperity has not been hitherto in proportion to its natural wealth; but the Legislature has understood the importance of material progress in all its bearings; it has ordered the building of new railways, and has concluded several favourable commercial treaties with foreign Powers.

"All these measures could be taken without disturbing the

equilibrium of the Budget, and in some respects—as, for instance, the price of salt—it could even lighten the burden of taxation.

“The Diet has accomplished great and difficult works, and the result has strengthened the conviction in us that the basis on which in so short a time so many salutary institutions could be founded has all the conditions of solidity; that this basis is good, and is conformable to the true interests of the nation. . . .

“The symptoms of material and moral improvement which are apparent every where may fill your hearts with joy, and if once the success follows with which Providence rewards perseverance and energy, posterity will gratefully remember those who have been the instruments of the welfare of the country. . . .

“May the Almighty make this loyal understanding lasting,—this understanding which has not only produced great political results, but which has linked together Sovereign and people in the bonds of mutual confidence and love, and which has made us feel that only a happy nation can have a happy Sovereign.

“We declare the Hungarian Diet closed.”

The following “Explosive Bullet Treaty” was signed in November at St. Petersburg, by the representatives of Bavaria, Belgium, Denmark, England, France, Greece, Holland, Italy, Persia, Portugal, Austria, Prussia, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and Würtemberg:—

“Considering that the progress of civilization ought to result in diminishing as much as possible the sufferings inseparable from war; that the only legitimate object pursued in war is to weaken the force of the enemy; that to attain this it suffices to place as many men as possible *hors de combat*; that to make use of expedients which shall unnecessarily enlarge the wounds of the men placed *hors de combat*, or entail inevitable death, is incompatible with the before-mentioned object; that to make use of such expedients would, moreover, be contrary to the teachings of humanity;

“The undersigned, in virtue of the instructions given them by their Governments, are authorized to declare as follows:—

“I. The contracting parties engage, in the event of war between any of them, to abstain from the use of missiles of any description possessing explosive power, or filled with explosive or inflammable material, weighing less than 400 grammes. This restriction to apply to the army and navy alike.

“II. They likewise invite all those States not represented at the deliberations of the Military Commission assembled at St. Petersburg, to subscribe to this mutual engagement.

“III. In the event of war this engagement is to be observed only towards the contracting parties, and those that may subsequently subscribe to it. It need not be observed towards any who have not signified their assent to the above stipulations.

“IV. The above engagement likewise ceases to be valid if a

State that has not signed it takes part in a war between parties that have signed it.

"V. Whenever the progress of science results in any new definite proposals being made for improving the equipment of the troops, the contracting parties, as well as those who have subsequently joined this engagement, will assemble to maintain the principles laid down to reconcile the requirements of war with the demands of humanity."

DENMARK.

At the opening of the Danish Diet on the 5th of October the King, adverting to the question of the re-annexation of North Schleswig to the Crown of Denmark, said, "The confidential negotiations with Prussia respecting the free vote in North Schleswig, provided for in the Treaty of Prague, have hitherto been without result. Our views of what justice and the well-understood interests of both countries require in this matter are unaltered. We must regard it as our first duty to co-operate towards no arrangement which, while not satisfying the wants of the inhabitants, might lead to future difficulties for the Danish Kingdom in its relations with a country with which we wish to remain upon a friendly footing. We are convinced that Prussia approves these motives, and we hope to succeed in attaining the long-expected settlement on the basis of the above considerations."

SERVIA.

Prince Michael, the Sovereign of Servia, was assassinated at Belgrade on the 10th of June. He was walking in the Top-schieder Park in company with his cousin Anka Konstantinovich and her young daughter, when they were met by three members of the Radovanovich family, the father and two sons. The father had been condemned to twenty years' imprisonment, which however had been reduced to seven. It does not appear how he came to be at large, but so it was. After he and his sons had passed the Prince they turned and fired with pistols at him and the two ladies. The Prince was mortally wounded, and was then despatched by the assassins with their swords. The mother fell dead on the spot and the daughter also received a mortal wound. The regicides were seized and committed for trial, ten other persons being arrested as implicated in a conspiracy to place Prince Karageorgewicz upon the throne.

A Provisional Government was immediately formed, and Prince Milan, of the same Obrenovic family as the late Prince Michael, was elected to fill the vacant throne. He was a minor, and a Council of Regency was established to hold office until he came of age. At a meeting of the Chambers, or *Skuptschina*, as they are called, it was resolved that Prince Alexander Kara-

georgewicz and his descendants should never be permitted to wear the Servian crown.

The persons implicated in the murder, thirteen in number, were brought to trial, and the *acte d'accusation* declared the existence of a conspiracy to overthrow the Government in favour of Prince Karageorgewicz. Several of them were convicted and sentenced to death.

GREECE.

At the official reception on new year's day the King said in reply to the address of the President of the Ministry, "My heart and that of the Queen bleed at seeing so many thousand Christians obliged to find a refuge on the maternal soil of Greece. Humanity and the indissoluble laws of fraternity impose upon us a duty to give what succour we can under so great a calamity. I hope and trust that the new year will be a happier one than the last."

This had reference to an insurrection in Crete, a province of Turkey, of which the inhabitants are Greek, and where for some time past a desperate attempt had been going on to throw off the Turkish yoke.

The Greek Government not only connived at but almost openly encouraged the revolutionary movement in Crete. Armed cruisers were fitted out in the Greek ports and sailed for the island, while volunteers in uniform paraded the streets of Athens. The tone of the press was very warlike, and ridiculed the power of Turkey, as if Greece alone were more than a match for her. In reality, however, the Greek Government relied upon the support of Russia, and believed that whatever might be the result of a war, the great Powers would never ultimately permit the Sublime Porte to regain possession of a country which had been wrested from it by the battle of Navarino. But the situation became intolerable to Turkey, and on the 10th of December the Turkish Minister at Athens delivered an *ultimatum* from his Government demanding the dispersion within five days of the volunteers; that the formation of other similar corps should be forbidden; that the ships for the re-victualling of Crete should be dismantled; that the Cretans who had sought refuge in Greece should be sent back; that those persons should be punished by whom a Turkish officer at Syra had been wounded; and, finally, that the Greek Government should conduct itself in conformity with existing treaties.

This *ultimatum* was rejected by the Greek Government, and diplomatic relations between it and the Sublime Porte were broken off. A Greek blockade-runner called the "Enosia," exchanged shots near Syra with a Turkish man-of-war, and took refuge in the port of that island, which was blockaded by the Turkish Admiral, Hobart Pasha. The result was that France proposed a Conference of the great Powers to consider the state of affairs, and we shall give the result in our next volume.

CHAPTER IV.

ABYSSINIAN WAR.

Preliminary events—Letter from King Theodore to Queen Victoria—Imprisonment of Englishmen—Ineffectual efforts for their release—Military expedition determined upon—Arrival of British troops in Annesley Bay—Address of General Napier to the army—Letters from the Captives—March on Magdala—The Bashilo ravine crossed—Encounter with King Theodore's troops—Surrender of the Captives—Storming of Magdala—Death of King Theodore—Magdala burnt—General Napier's address to the army—Results of the campaign.

IN 1848 Mr. Plowden was appointed British Consul in Abyssinia, and he continued to hold that office until 1860. The ruler of the country was Dejazmatch Kasai, who had usurped the throne, and on his coronation in 1855 assumed the name and style of "Theodorus, King of Ethiopia," there being an ancient prophecy that a king of this name would reform Abyssinia, restore the Christian faith, and become master of the world. He had a new seal engraved with the motto "King of Kings." His capital was Magdala, a fortress crowning a steep and lofty height, which properly defended would be almost impregnable. In 1860 Mr. Plowden, while on his way to Massowah, was attacked near Gondar by a band of rebels, and received a wound of which he soon afterwards died. King Theodore seems to have sincerely lamented his death, and he took signal vengeance on his murderers. In 1861 Captain Cameron was appointed Consul in the place of Mr. Plowden, and he proceeded to Abyssinia. At the end of October in that year the King addressed a letter to Queen Victoria, which was in the following terms:—

"In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, one God in Trinity, chosen by God, King of Kings, Theodorus of Ethiopia to her Majesty Victoria, Queen of England. I hope your Majesty is in good health. By the power of God I am well. My fathers the Emperors having forgotten our Creator, He handed over their kingdom to the Gallas and Turks. But God created me, lifted me out of the dust, and restored this empire to my rule. He endowed me with power, and enabled me to stand in the place of my fathers. By His power I drove away the Gallas. But for the Turks, I have told them to leave the land of my ancestors. They refuse. I am now going to wrestle with them. Mr. Plowden, and my late Grand Chamberlain, the Englishman Bell, used to tell me that there is a great Christian Queen, who loves all Christians. When they said to me this, 'We are able to make you known to her, and to establish friendship between you,' then in those times I was very glad. I gave them my love, thinking that I had found your Majesty's good-will. All men are subject

to death, and my enemies, thinking to injure me, killed these my friends. But by the power of God I have exterminated those enemies, not leaving one alive, though they were of my own family, that I may get, by the power of God, your friendship.

"I was prevented by the Turks occupying the sea-coast from sending you an Embassy when I was in difficulty. Consul Cameron arrived with a letter and presents of friendship. By the power of God I was very glad hearing of your welfare, and being assured of your amity. I have received your presents, and thank you much.

"I fear that if I send ambassadors with presents of amity by Consul Cameron, they may be arrested by the Turks.

"And now I wish that you may arrange for the safe passage of my ambassadors every where on the road.

"I wish to have an answer to this letter by Consul Cameron, and that he may conduct my Embassy to England. See how the Islam oppress the Christian!"

Mr. Cameron forwarded this letter to England, and then went into the frontier province of Bogos. The Christian inhabitants of that region had been under the protection of the British Consul, and Mr. Cameron thought that he was justified in following the steps of the former Consul, Mr. Plowden. King Theodore, however, imagined that he was interfering with the internal politics of the country in behalf of his enemies, and was especially angry because Mr. Cameron, after visiting Bogos, went into the neighbouring Egyptian provinces. To use the King's own expression, "He went to the Turks, who do not love me. . . . He stayed with them some time and returned to me." Earl Russell also signified his disapproval of Mr. Cameron's conduct, and in a despatch to Colonel Stanton, the British Consul in Egypt, dated the 5th of October, 1865, he said, "Captain Cameron in going to Bogos acted without orders, and incurred the displeasure of his own Government." And no doubt if Captain Cameron did interfere in the obscure politics of the country he did wrong, for no one can doubt the wisdom of the course prescribed by Lord Stanley in a despatch addressed to Colonel Stanton on the 15th of December, 1866, when he said, "Her Majesty's Government do not feel themselves in any way called on to interfere in differences and disputes between native tribes residing respectively on the frontiers of Egypt and Abyssinia." But it must be stated in Captain Cameron's defence that he was not without excuse for the course he adopted in visiting the Egyptian provinces. He says in a letter written by him from Magdala on the 13th of November, 1866, "At Bogos I got a letter from the Foreign Office directing me to report on the comparative merits of Souakin and Massowah as the seat of a Consulate; also to report on the trade of Souakin. It was this which led me to go to the trading stations of Cassala and Matamma." And in another letter he observed, "I feel somewhat like the lad in the 'Arabian Nights,' who made his cheese-

cakes with pepper, and found that in so doing he had committed a great political offence."

In the meantime no notice was taken by the British Government of the letter addressed by King Theodore to the Queen. It lay neglected in the archives of the Foreign Office, and when Earl Russell wrote to Captain Cameron in answer to the letter from him which accompanied the King's letter, he made no allusion to it. This gave mortal offence to the King, and he determined in revenge to make prisoners of all the Europeans he could lay hold of in Abyssinia. Ineffectual attempts were made to induce him to release them, and the Armenian Patriarch at Constantinople addressed a letter in February, 1867, to King Theodore, praying him to set free the captives. He said,—

"I have long been seeking an opportunity of offering my prayers and homage to your Majesty's throne. I therefore now venture to forward my present petition, and avail myself of the opportunity to solicit the pardon and liberation of your Majesty's slaves the English Consul and his companions, who have been for some time past imprisoned in Abyssinia. Indeed, I beg leave to observe that the said Consul and his companions have been for a very long period in confinement, and that they have no help or refuge save in the mercy and clemency of your Majesty.

"Should your Majesty be pleased to pardon them, your doing so would afford much gratification to the whole of our Christian community, and also great satisfaction to the illustrious British Government, whose efforts in the interest of Christianity are well known."

He also despatched Archbishop Sahak on a mission to the King, in hopes that by a personal interview the object might be attained.

We need not detail all the efforts that were made to persuade Theodore peaceably to release the prisoners, as they were abortive, and at last the English Government determined to send a military expedition to Abyssinia and effect the object by force.

General Sir Robert Napier, an Indian officer of Engineers, was selected for the command of the expedition, which was to be wholly fitted out in India.

The first detachment of troops arrived in Annesley Bay on the coast of Abyssinia in October last year. The locality has been thus described :—

"The view from the anchorage at Annesley Bay is magnificent; high ranges of mountains rise close from the shore in some places, and on a clear day other ranges may be seen, still more elevated, far behind them. The higher peaks of the first range are said to be 5000 feet in height, and so deceptive are distances in this dry, clear climate, that they seem quite close, although upwards of thirty miles distant."

"Between the mountains and the shore there is a sandy plain, in many places covered with a saline incrustation and flooded with the higher spring tides. Broad watercourses, which during the

rainy season must be foaming torrents, traverse this plain, and in many places their beds are filled with large boulders, washed down from the hills."

The advanced guard under Brigadier-General Merewether pushed on to Senafe, on the highland of Abyssinia, and on the 3rd of January this year General Napier arrived in Annesley Bay. He issued an address to the troops in which he said that he was "confident that every soldier in the force appreciates the honour of having been selected to carry out the commands of her Majesty the Queen of England, and that neither hardships nor dangers will arrest it in pursuit of the objects of the expedition, the release of our countrymen detained in a painful captivity, and the vindication of the dignity of her Majesty's empire."

The whole force consisted of 11,770 soldiers (most of the regiments being native infantry), and about 14,000 followers attached to the land transport train, commissariat department, and regiments.

The army marched from Senafe to Attegrath, and thence through a country which was thus described in an account written on the spot: "The road from Attegrath to the front runs for the first five miles up a gently rising valley, bounded on the east by stony hills covered with cactus and acacia, on the west by the towering and precipitous cliffs of Mount Alequa. Then one of the spurs of the western mountains stretches straight across the valley, and bars the way. The labours of the Beloochees have made a road up the side of the Goon-Goon spur, which is surmounted by a wide plateau of sandstone. After keeping two miles over this plateau, the road plunges down suddenly into a deep and rugged ravine. The road both down and up the banks of this ravine is extremely difficult, and its difficulties had, unfortunately, been overlooked by the pioneer force, which, as a rule, has been more careful in marking out the easy parts of the level, which required little labour, than in tackling the rugged defiles or steep and broken hills. Here the guns had to be unlimbered to allow them to be got round the sharp angles of the track; horses had to be taken out and led up singly, while the gunners and some of the 10th Native Infantry dragged the guns up by hand for a distance of about half a mile. Beyond the Goon-Goon ravine the road again passes over a wide plateau bounded by distant cliffs, which raise their sharp and serrated peaks clear against the sky. The plateau itself, clothed with short grass in which lie enormous numbers of loose stones, and occasionally broken by massive lumps of sheet rock, bears a slight resemblance to the moor-land on the Scottish border—a resemblance which was heightened, as the column passed, by a storm of thunder and lightning, and the downfall of a most excellent African imitation of a Scottish mist."

A letter from Mr. Rassam, one of the captives, dated Magdala, September 7, 1867, was published in the newspapers, and it gave some

interesting particulars of the state of affairs in Abyssinia. He said, "The rebellion has now become general all over Abyssinia, the few districts between the royal camp at Debrataboor and this place have thrown off their allegiance to King Theodorus, and consequently they have closed the roads against all travellers, and have succeeded so far as to prevent public communication from taking place between Debrataboor and Magdala. For the last four months the Emperor has only communicated three times with this place, and even then he was obliged to employ a servant of one of the native prisoners in order that he might not be recognized. Our royal friend is now becoming quite desperate, and consequently he spares neither male nor female if any of the rebels happen to fall into his hands; the rebels, on the other hand, imitate the practice of their late master by butchering any person found outside the hedge which is now built outside the royal camp. I have only been able to communicate with Mr. Flad at Debrataboor since his return. Every time I tried to send a messenger they were plundered, but the letters they have always managed to save. The carnage which takes place daily in the royal camp from famine, pestilence, and the sword is quite terrifying. 2500 men who had intended to run away were butchered like sheep, and 295 chiefs were starved to death, after they had had their arms and feet cut off, for the same reason. For two whole days, from morning till evening, nothing was heard but reports of musketry, and at each discharge either the wife, mother, or child of a deserter was killed. Ladies of noble families were tortured to death, and the poor creatures breathed their last under most frightful agony. Men are now held responsible for the desertion of their brothers-in-law, sons-in-law, or fathers-in-law, as they are expected to know the movements of their marriage relations. Between forty and fifty persons die daily of different diseases.

"Some one has told the Emperor that if he persisted in keeping me and my fellow-prisoners in this country, England would be compelled to fight him. 'Let them come,' said he, 'and call me a woman if I do not beat them.'"

And in a letter written by Lieutenant Prideaux, one of his captives, on the 28th of January this year, he thus described the situation: "On Sunday, the 26th inst., the detachment of troops which had been summoned from the mountain by the King returned, bringing with them, besides a large quantity of baggage, 180 native and five European prisoners. The latter consisted of Messrs. Staiger, Brandeis, Schiller, Essler, and Makerer, who had been accused of attempting to make their escape from the royal camp in January last. Since that period these unfortunate men have suffered nearly incredible hardships. Up to the end of the rainy season they were chained two and two together by the hands and feet, their servants all seized, and some of them afterwards killed, and themselves condemned to lie, naked and starving, upon the bare ground. Daily the fear of death was before them. On one

occasion twenty-seven, on another thirty-seven, native prisoners were dragged out of their prison-house to execution, and it was not long before they and one native were the sole occupants of the room. When the King left Debrataboor, in October last, *en route* for this place, they were each chained hand and foot, in the Shoa fashion, and had to march along in this manner as far as Aibunkub, a distance of thirty miles; at that place their hand chains were opened, and they were able, by the occasional loan of a mule, to proceed in a more comfortable manner. They arrived here, each chained to a native by the right hand, but expect to receive the same fetters as the rest of the European captives in a day or two. The native prisoners have fared still worse. They are nearly all dying from torture and starvation."

"February 8.

"The districts of Daunt and Dalanta have given in their submission to the King; their only alternative was to desert their houses and fields, and they preferred submission. A few weeks before they pledged their allegiance to the Gallas, and the King has not forgotten this. He has informed a deputation from Daunt that, as soon as the cannons and heavy baggage are safely landed in Dalanta, it would be his Majesty's first duty to inflict due punishment on the tribes of the Wollo, until, to use his own expression, 'their bones were all white as onions on the plain.' The peasants of Dalanta have been visited still more severely with the royal displeasure."

"February 15.

"One of our principal doubts was solved this morning by the intelligence that the King was not only aware of the arrival of the British troops and of their disembarkation at Zoulla, but that he must have been cognizant of these circumstances fully two months ago. He has communicated his knowledge to his European artisans and to Mr. Flad, and has expressed his pleasure at the prospect of enjoying in a short time the sight of a disciplined force, comparing himself at the same time to Simeon when he held the infant Saviour in his arms."

Again, on the 8th of March he said, "The King while here sent polite messages to Mr. Rassam, and said that he knew the English troops were near, and that he was prepared to meet them. Near or not, we have had no further news of them. His Majesty is to-day employed in making a good road up the mountain for his big gun, which will probably arrive at the top in a week or ten days."

"March 31.

"You will all be glad to learn that the day before yesterday the King was gracious enough to release Dr. Blanc and myself from our chains—an event for which we were quite unprepared. At 10 p.m. on Saturday night (28th) Blanc and myself were informed that we were to receive some other inmates in our room—Cameron, Rosenthal, and Kerana—and were to be strictly watched all night.

Four guards with lighted candles remained in the same room with us, and led us to suppose that we might expect something unpleasant on the morrow. We were, however, agreeably disappointed. In the course of the following day his Majesty visited the mountain. About half an hour after his arrival he sent Mr. Flad with a message to Mr. Rassam to the effect that he might expect an interview, and shortly after he was summoned to the presence of his Majesty. A silk tent had been pitched on the plain, carpets had been spread, and every thing had been done for the reception of the envoy in proper Ethiopian state. On Mr. Rassam's departure we naturally felt a little anxious, but were soon cheered up by the arrival of Mr. Flad, who informed us that at the solicitation of Mr. Rassam our chains had been ordered to be opened. As soon as the irons had been knocked off we repaired to his Majesty's presence, and were most graciously received. All the conversation that passed I cannot remember, except that it may be described as being of rather a humorous character, his Majesty being in excellent spirits, and not the least in Cambyse's vein. We remained about a quarter of an hour with the King, drank a glass of tedj, and then departed, his Majesty's son, a fair little boy about seven years of age, and all the European artisans accompanying us home. It is a great relief to have the chains off, although in other respects we are watched as strictly as ever."

Mr. Rassam also wrote a long account, dated Magdala, April 5th, from which we extract the following passages:—

"As soon as the King crossed the valley of the Bashilo, on the 18th ult., he sent me a polite letter, and ordered my chains to be struck off. He said that when he sent me to Magdala he did not intend to have put me in chains, but that the authorities of this fortress had done so without his orders, as a precautionary measure. I was extremely grieved that my fellow-captives, especially Mr. Prideaux and Dr. Blanc, were not similarly relieved, but to insist upon such a thing in a barbarous country would be like cutting one's throat and endangering the safety of one's companions in bondage. In my answer to his Majesty I solicited his granting the same boon to my party, but he gave no heed to my request then. On the 26th idem he reached Salamee, a plateau below the north-western gate of Magdala, and the next day he came up here to settle some complaints which were made against some of the chiefs of this garrison for treason.

"On the 29th the King came up again here in the afternoon for the purpose of counting the reinforcement he had sent up the day before yesterday with Bitwadid Hasanee. Before he did so, however, he sent and told me that he wished to see me. A silk tent was pitched in the plain in front of our compound for my reception. When he came up he was in an awful rage, and every one feared that I should have a bad reception. When he passed our compound he sent to me by Mr. Mayer (one of the European artisans) to say that the reason he had ill-treated me was because

my brethren (British army) to come against him. 'They are now coming to take you out,' said he, 'and I am ready to meet them.' His Majesty asked me to appear before him in my uniform, as I used to do before. No sooner was I dressed than Bitwadiid Hasanee came to say that his Majesty was ready to receive me. Messrs. Flad and Mayer accompanied me to the royal pavilion. On going out of the compound I found about 400 officers in attendance in front of the silk tent, and his Majesty was inside with his European servants. No sooner did I approach the enraged monarch than he changed his demeanour and welcomed me in a most polite style. He shook hands with me in the European custom, standing, and then sat down on a silk carpet worked with gold thread, and asked me to sit by him on his right hand. He said the reason he did not allow the throne to be placed there was because he did not like to sit higher than me, I being his friend and the representative of the great Queen of England. He then opened the subject of the war, and said that, whether victorious or not, he would always consider me as his true friend, but other Europeans he complained of for having abused him. He then said that I had brought two persons with me (Dr. Blanc and Mr. Prideaux) to this country, for whom he had neither love nor hatred, but if I became security for their good behaviour he would release them from their chains for my sake. I replied that it would delight me greatly if he did so, and that I would hold myself responsible for all their acts. 'If they do any thing to displease your Majesty,' I said, 'the whole blame shall fall on me, and you can then say Mr. Rassam has committed the fault, and not Dr. Blanc or Mr. Prideaux.' He immediately sent Mr. Flad and Aitoo Samuel to release them and to bring them to join me.

"On the 2nd inst. the King sent for me to go down with my companions, Dr. Blanc and Mr. Prideaux, and see the great mortar being brought up to Salamgee. We went down very early, and saw his Majesty superintending the making of the new road for bringing up the guns and mortars which had been brought up from Debrataboor. He received us most politely, and asked us to sit behind him on some loose stones on the edge of a precipice overlooking the soldiery who were pulling up the gun-waggons. As soon as the large mortar, which is called 'Sevastopol,' reached the turn of the road below us, where we could see it plainly, his Majesty asked me what I thought of it. I replied that it was most magnificent, and added that I hoped that it would not be long before my brothers (British troops) would be looking on it with the same friendly pleasure which I then experienced. He smiled and said, 'I hope so, too.' After that I asked him to gladden my heart by ordering my remaining five fellow-captives to be released of their chains. His Majesty at once acceded to my request, and sent and had them unfettered.

"His Majesty asked me first about European warfare, and how peace was concluded among kings at the termination of a war;

how far the rifles of our soldiery carried, and how the word of command was given. After I had answered these questions he asked me what number of troops had been sent by England against him. I said I had heard that about 12,000 men had been sent, but I did not think that more than 6000 or 7000 would come here. I then told him about the elephants and the bands, and said that I thought his Majesty would be very much pleased when he heard their music. He replied that had he been as powerful as he once was he would certainly have gone down to the coast to meet our people on landing, or he would have sent and asked them what they wanted in his country. 'But now,' he added, 'I have lost Abyssinia, excepting this rock, and it would be quite foolish of me to say any thing; however, I am ready to meet them here, and I must submit to the will of my Creator.' He then spoke about the return of Captain Cameron to Abyssinia without an answer to his letter which he had sent to our Queen. He said, 'After he returned to my country I waited five days before I knew that he had returned without an answer. I then sent and asked him why he came back without a reply.'"

We need not give the details of the difficult march of the army over the rocky highlands of Abyssinia, which would be a tremendous country to traverse in the face of a brave and active enemy. But the troops met with no opposition whatever, and the disposition of the inhabitants seemed quite friendly. They readily supplied provisions when they found that they were paid for; and some of the chiefs gave active assistance. The troops reached the deep ravine through which the river Bashilo flows, early in April. The following description conveys a good idea of it:—"At the foot the Bashilo river flows in an apparently muddy stream, and larger than any we have hitherto met on the line of march. On the south side, or that next Magdala, the ascent is much more gradual, but the whole country is broken up into deep ravines and high hills. They are very bare, and almost denuded of brushwood or trees, so that in a military point of view they are deprived of a formidable difficulty we might have encountered if the enemy had been able to conceal themselves in the hills and annoy us on our line of march. With this exception, I have never seen more difficult marching ground or a portion of country less suited for manœuvring troops of all arms. The hills, of which Magdala forms one, are a group of three separated from the Talanta plateau by the Bashilo ravine, and from the Tanta plain to the south and west by a valley equally formidable and apparently about ten miles in breadth. Of this isolated cluster Magdala is the most distant from us, and seems to have the largest table-land on its summit. The two other mountains, Selassee and Fahla, are nearly parallel to the Bashilo, and are separated by a saddle which is nearly a mile in length. Fahla is nearest to our line of march, and is crowned by a scarp along the side next to us. On the top of it there is a small clump of trees which forms a good point of obser-

vation. There is a good encamping ground close under Fahla, where water is obtainable, and it is about two and a half miles from Theodore's camp, so it is probable that this point will be occupied before an attack is made. Selassee is a mountain with a high scarp all round the top, and three other small ones at intervals down the sides. Between these small scarps, which, judging from their appearance through a field-glass, are from twenty to thirty feet high, Theodore's army is encamped. They are close to the saddle, between Fahla and Selassee, at a portion of the hill called Islamgee. The road to Magdala passes over the saddle between Fahla and Selassee, and close to Theodore's camp, which latter commands it. Magdala is seen between the two hills, about a mile behind them. A small scarp surrounds the top of the former, and houses and trees are seen distinctly upon it. The Kokiburg gate is on the side next Selassee, and is seen from the Talanta plateau. The road, after passing near the King's camp, dips between Selassee and Magdala, and is not seen. Close to the Kokiburg gate it again appears in view, ascending into Magdala at a very steep gradient."

On Good Friday Colonel Phayre was ordered to cross the Bashilo with a reconnoitring party, and avoiding the road made by Theodore up through the Arogee Pass to the foot of Fahla, to ascend the two mountain spurs which lay on the right of that road between the Bashilo river and Magdala. The following describes the locality:—"Up to the head of the Bashilo Pass, where we were encamped, the ground is perfectly level table-land, but the plateau suddenly breaks in some places as precipitously and sharply as if it had been cut with a knife, and the whole country between it and Magdala, and indeed in almost every direction as far as the eye can reach, presents one huge, tangled, inextricable mass of hills, scarps, and ravines, lying, as it were, like the labyrinth of which protected fair Rosamond, between any invader and Magdala. However, Theodore's road threads the mazes of this labyrinth, runs up to the top of Fahla, and thence turning sharply to the left, or east, connects Fahla with Islamgee (the site of the King's camp), and Selassee and Magdala. Fahla, Selassee, and Magdala prove, on close inspection, to form one large three-cornered amba, being of nearly the same elevation, though differing materially in the steepness of their approaches, and mutually protecting and flanking each other. The distance between the extreme points of this amba, originally estimated at two miles and a half, can scarcely be more than a mile and a half."

Colonel Phayre, however, instead of marching with his whole force to the right after he had crossed the Bashilo, divided his troops and sent a body of troops and a mountain battery, under the command of Colonel Milward, up the Arogee Pass. He himself, with a larger body of men, proceeded over broken precipitous ground to the right. At the top of the Arogee Pass stood the hill of Fahla, occupied by King Theodore, who opened fire upon the advancing column under Colonel Milward.

Fortunately Sir Robert Napier had reached an eminence on the left, and seeing that Colonel Milward was unsupported, he sent down the Punjab Pioneers to reinforce him. A hot engagement now took place, in which our Naval Rocket Brigade (under Commander Fellowes) and the mountain battery (under Colonel Penn) did excellent service. In the meantime the 4th regiment (King's own) came up, and their Snider rifles made terrible havoc in the Abyssinian ranks.

An eye-witness says, "How they kept their ground at all when Sniders, mountain guns, and rockets had begun to get fairly at them is a marvel, and says a good deal for their national 'pluck,' notwithstanding that they never managed to hold even for a few minutes after the first impetuous onset any ground from which it was attempted to dislodge them. That they came on so pluckily is accounted for by their mistaking the character of the force, but this mistake, soon discovered, could only have contributed to their confusion, and yet to the very last, though they had left, it is thought, some 500 comrades dead on the field, among them their leader, Theodore's favourite general, and must have had at least three times that number wounded, they kept up some show of resistance, rallied to make a few faint charges, and mustered up spirits enough for a mock-victorious cheer when Sir Charles Staveley, as night was coming on and nothing more was to be gained by useless butchery, sounded the retreat."

It is a remarkable fact that notwithstanding the hot fire poured down upon our troops by the Abyssinians, we had not a single man killed, and only nineteen wounded.

Next morning Mr. Flad and Lieutenant Prideaux appeared in the British camp with a flag of truce sent by the King to make terms. Sir Robert Napier, however, insisted that the prisoners should be unconditionally surrendered, and the result was that they were all sent into the camp.

On the 13th of April two brigades, consisting of 5000 men, under Sir Charles Staveley, moved forward to attack Magdala itself. They marched along the road which led up to Fahla and through what had been Theodore's camp at Islamgee to Selassee and Magdala. "These three hills form a sort of roughly-shaped T, except that Selassee and Magdala slant outwards on either side away from Fahla, instead of being at right angles to it, and as they all flank and protect each other, and are connected by a mountain, isolated, and rising many hundred feet above the plain, and with its sides broken up into scarps and terraces, most of them perfectly precipitous, they form together a natural stronghold which, perhaps, has not its parallel in the known world. Of the strength of Magdala itself it is, perhaps, impossible to give an adequate idea. It is protected by lofty, almost overhanging cliffs, so precipitous that a cat could not climb them, except at two points, north and south, at each of which a steep, narrow path leads up to a strong gateway. It was by the northern gateway, as being on the side

commanded by Selassie, that our troops had to effect an entrance."

As the troops approached the stronghold they opened a hot fire of shot, shell and rockets, but made no impression upon the gateway, which was protected by a strong stockade. Here was stationed the King, with a small band of faithful followers, but the rest of his army had abandoned the place.

The attacking troops forced their way over the stockade, and rushing into the fortress cut down the few Abyssinians, who died fighting bravely to the last, but the King retreated to a spot higher up, and there shot himself with a pistol before the soldiers could reach him. His body was found dead on the ground. Our whole loss was only that of ten men wounded.

Sir Robert Napier at first offered to make over Magdala to an Abyssinian chief named Gobaze, who had recently made himself master of the country between Antalo and Magdala, and who had shown himself friendly to the expedition. But Gobaze declined the proposal, and therefore, to prevent the place from falling in all its strength into the hands of the fierce Mahommedan tribe of the Gallas, the hereditary enemies of the Christians, he determined, as far as possible, to destroy it, and the town was set on fire and burnt to the ground. Upwards of thirty guns were also destroyed, and to use the expression of Sir Robert Napier, "nothing but blackened rock remains."

Sir Robert Napier issued an address to the army, dated Camp Dalsola, April 20, in which he said, "I congratulate you with all my heart on the noble way in which you have fulfilled the commands of our Sovereign. You have traversed, often under a tropical sun, or amidst storms of rain and sleet, 400 miles of mountainous and difficult country. You have crossed many steep and precipitous ranges of mountains, more than 10,000 feet in altitude, where your supplies could not keep pace with you.

"When you arrived within reach of your enemy, though with scanty food, and some of you for many hours without either food or water, in four days you passed the formidable chasm of the Bashilo and defeated the army of Theodore, which poured down upon you from their lofty fortress in the full confidence of victory.

"A host of many thousands have laid down their arms at your feet.

"You have captured and destroyed upwards of thirty pieces of artillery, many of great weight and efficiency, with ample stores of ammunition. You have stormed the almost inaccessible fortress of Magdala, defended by Theodore, with the desperate remnant of his chiefs and followers.

"After you forced the entrance, Theodore, who never showed mercy, distrusted the offer of mercy held out to him, and died by his own hand.

"You have released not only the British captives, but those of other friendly nations.

"You have unloosed the chains of more than ninety of the principal chiefs of Abyssinia.

"Magdala, on which so many victims have been slaughtered, has been committed to the flames, and remains only a scorched rock.

"Our complete and rapid success is due, first, to the mercy of God, whose hand, I feel assured, has been over us in a just cause; secondly, to the high spirit with which you have been inspired.

"Indian soldiers have forgotten the prejudices of race and creed to keep pace with their European comrades.

"Never has an army entered into a war with more honourable feelings than yours. This has carried you through many fatigues and difficulties; you have been only eager for the moment when you could close with your enemy.

"The remembrance of your privations will pass away quickly, but your gallant exploit will live in history.

"The Queen and the people of England will appreciate your services. . . ."

In a despatch addressed by him to the Secretary of State for India, dated Suez, June 18, he thus summed up the results of the campaign as it affected the political situation in Abyssinia:—

"On the whole, it may be said that the effect of our expedition on the political aspect of Abyssinia has been the following:—The province of Tigre, which we found just struggling into independence, has been somewhat strengthened and settled by us. Wagshoom Gobaze, who at the date of our arrival was attempting a hopeless opposition to Theodorus, should now be able to establish his position. Theodorus had acquired by conquest a Sovereignty which he knew only how to abuse. He was not strong enough to protect the people from other oppressors, while yet able to carry plunder and cruelty into every district he himself might visit. I fail to discover a single point of view from which it is possible to regard his removal with regret. I think it may be said that the object of the expedition has been accomplished without the rights of any of the princes or chiefs of the country having been interfered with by us, and that the prospect of Abyssinia enjoying tranquillity is at this day fairer than it was at the date when our army landed on the coast."

We need only add that after the destruction of Magdala the expedition set out on its return, and Abyssinia was abandoned by British troops, we hope, for ever.

·CHAPTER V.

UNITED STATES.

Bill for the Protection of American Naturalized Citizens—Speeches on the subject—New Bill introduced and passed—Impeachment of the President—The Trial and its Result—Manifesto by the Republican Party—Mr. Reverdy Johnson appointed Minister to Great Britain—Bill for Readmission of Arkansas to the Union—Reasons of the President for vetoing the Bill—Passing of the "Omnibus Bill" for re-admitting States into the Union—Financial Statement.

At the end of January the House of Representatives was engaged in the discussion of a Bill for the protection of the rights of American naturalized citizens in foreign States. It was introduced by General Banks, Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs, to whom the question had been referred, who said that the subject was a very difficult one, embracing the legislation of America and of foreign countries, and the Committee of Foreign Affairs did not see an immediate and perfect solution of the difficulty, but presented this Bill as the nearest approach to it. He then entered upon an inquiry as to what classes of persons the United States should *not* undertake to protect when abroad, and said it must be admitted that a man who committed a crime within a foreign State submits himself to the jurisdiction of that State. So a man who had actually deserted from the army or navy of a foreign Power would probably be held by that Power precisely as under the circumstances he would be held by the American Government. These cases, however, he did not think affected prospective military obligations, and he was sure that the subject of a foreign Power who might be called upon to do military service, and who emigrated with the knowledge and consent of his Government could not be held as a deserter. There was another class of cases to which the protection of the American Government should not extend. These were cases of fraudulent naturalization, practised largely by persons from South and Central America, who came to the United States and procured naturalization for the purpose of returning to their own countries and there exempting themselves from military and other obligations. Protection, also, should not be extended to people, either native-born or naturalized, who went to reside in foreign countries on account of the cheapness of living, while they were drawing 10, 12, or 15 per cent. income on their property in the United States. As an explanation of his idea of the rights of a naturalized citizen when abroad, General Banks said that a naturalized citizen had exactly the same rights in foreign countries as a native-born citizen. The one had no right or privilege which the other could not claim, and it was the first and highest duty of the Government to accord its protection to the naturalized pre-

cisely as to the native-born citizen. In reference to a proposed amendment that the United States had never recognized the right of expatriation, General Banks said the judgment of the Foreign Committee was exactly the reverse. In the very nature of the Government the right was admitted, and had been exercised since the foundation of the Government. The Courts had said indirectly, but never judicially, that expatriation was not a right of American citizens, because it was not a right of English subjects at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. But this was not the law of the country, and the Executive had maintained the opposite doctrine in every case. One or two distinguished public officers had yielded to the suggestion of the judicial tribunals, and had in their papers recognized in the English sense the doctrine of emigration or naturalization, but they had never declared this to be the doctrine of the United States. The reason why the Bill did not declare expatriation to be a right of American citizens was clear. A legislative act at this day by the Congress of the United States recognizing the right of expatriation would be interpreted by European Governments as a declaration dating from this time, and would effectually cut off all privileges and claims of naturalized citizens in foreign States up to this time. It was for that reason, whenever this question had been presented, that Congress had always dismissed the proposition as legislation that was unnecessary, and that would be fatal to large numbers of naturalized citizens. The Bill did not propose to define what constituted naturalization, but simply applied to the rights of naturalized citizens when abroad. So long as claims were made by European States, and especially by Great Britain, affecting so large a portion of the people of the United States, this Government could never recognize nor submit to such a limitation of the rights of its citizens. Three-fifths of the 35,000,000 inhabitants of the United States were interested one way or another in foreign countries. They had the right to travel, and the greatest punishment which could be inflicted on any man or nation was the denial of the right of locomotion. He concluded with the remark that he "thought it would be found that in this Bill there was nothing conceded to European Governments which should not be conceded in point of law, and which the American Government would demand for itself; and that there was nothing claimed for American citizens, naturalized or native-born, which must not be maintained at whatever cost."

Mr. Ward (*Republican*), of New York, asked General Banks what was meant by the language of the first section of the Bill, which empowered the President to use the resources of the nation to secure from foreign Governments a recognition of the American doctrine of naturalization. General Banks said to answer that question would require him to make a speech, which he did not propose to do at this time. Mr. Ward said that, in his opinion, those words conferred very great power—the power to declare war.

General Banks replied that they did not; the President of the United States never had such power. Mr. Donnelly (Republican), of Minnesota, said he was in favour of the Bill, but did not like some of its provisions. He objected to the retaliation clause, arguing that it would be an act of barbarity similar to that which had disgraced Napoleon when he issued his orders to seize all Englishmen in France. The true remedy, he thought, was that suggested by the proposed amendment of the hon. member from Ohio (Mr. Spalding), a declaration that such acts on the part of a foreign Government shall be just ground of war. Mr. Ward then said he sympathized fully with the objects of the Bill, but he was opposed to giving such extraordinary powers to the President; it was giving him the power to involve the nation at any time in war, and he thought that provision should be struck out, and that the President should report to Congress. Mr. Woodward (Democrat), of Pennsylvania, said he was in favour of the main features of the Bill, but thought it was defective in not providing for the expatriation of American citizens. The American Government was asking other Governments to provide for the expatriation of their subjects, and he thought it quite indispensable that this Government should begin by providing for the expatriation of its own citizens. He gave notice that at the proper time he would offer an amendment to meet this defect in the Bill. General Banks stated that the incorporation of such a provision would debar naturalized citizens of the right up to this date of claiming the protection of the Government. It was not necessary to proclaim the right of expatriation, for that already existed. Mr. Woodward replied that while the judiciary had not actually decided that there was no such right as expatriation, that was the inference from its decisions, and it could never be expected that foreign Governments would adopt the principle of the right of expatriation unless the United States declared that right to exist in its own citizens by statute. Mr. Wilson (Republican), of Iowa, said that this was a subject of grave public concern, and demanded care. Congress was not dealing with a mere question of elections, or playing a pleasing game for the votes of naturalized citizens. The great matter was that of expatriation, and in his judgment the Bill did not deal fairly with it. The first section provided that all naturalized citizens of the United States, while in foreign States, shall be entitled to and receive from this Government the same protection of persons and property that is accorded to native-born citizens in like circumstances. The section thus far was direct and positive, and challenged the attention and practice of every nation from which the United States had drawn the foreign element of population. It was affirmative, aggressive, and boldly American, and in these regards commanded respect and admiration; but it was destroyed by the succeeding declaration of the section, which gave the President power to employ all the resources of the Government in just efforts to procure the recognition by other States of the American doctrine. This

he considered as a complete demolition of the section, and as destroying the affirmative and aggressive character of the Bill. This was diplomacy, and not legislation. It would be a mere declaration that the "principles of public law" which had been insisted upon by the United States with regard to naturalized citizens should continue as a rule of conduct of the Republic. Mr. Wilson then considered at length the doctrines laid down by various law writers on the subject of allegiance, and combated the doctrine of perpetual allegiance. He admitted, however, that neither the American law writers nor the American judiciary had ever asserted a different rule; nor had the American Executive advanced beyond an attempt to induce foreign States, by negotiation, to consent to the adoption of a new rule of international law upon this subject. Therefore he considered that the section as it now stood could bear nothing but deceptive fruit. He thought the Foreign Committee intended, in preparing this Bill, to assert, in its broadest sense, the right of expatriation, and that they would assent to an amendment which would eliminate from it every vestige of our past observance of the indefensible feudal doctrine of indefeasible allegiance. Mr. Wilson concluded by stating that it was high time feudalism was driven from their shores and eliminated from their laws, and he hoped "our action upon the momentous question involved in this Bill may be such as will result in a thorough reversal of the past action of our Government, and in a legislative declaration which cannot be misunderstood by foreign Governments, or misinterpreted by that portion of our population who have become citizens by naturalization." Mr. Pile (Republican), of Missouri, expressed his fear that the Bill was simply to keep the word of promise to the ear and break it to the hope; and that it would leave four-fifths of their naturalized citizens from Prussia subject to arrest on their return to that country, because the Prussian military service was provided for by law. He denounced the retaliatory clause of the Bill as barbarous and inhuman. Mr. Myers (Republican), of Pennsylvania, stated that Mr. Wilson's objections were groundless, as the Foreign Committee had determined to amend the Bill in accordance with Mr. Wilson's views. He added that the objections made to the Bill seemed only for the purpose of making it more effectual in its main provisions; and he believed the House would unite and enact into a law a doctrine with regard to naturalization which uttered the sentiment of the American people. General Banks announced that the Committee had amended the Bill by striking out from the first section the words "insisted upon and maintained," and inserting the words "heretofore maintained." Also, that among the classes of persons declared to be not entitled to protection when abroad, the following were added:—Deserters from any military or naval conscription that might have been ordered in a foreign country, and citizens resident abroad who should fail to make reports of their property to the tax-collectors in the United States for taxation.

This Bill was however abandoned, and a new one on the same subject was reported to the House of Representatives by General Banks on the 20th of February. The preamble declared, "The right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, for the protection of which the Government of the United States was established;" that "in the recognition of this principle the Government has freely received emigrants from all nations, and invested them with the rights of citizenship;" that "it is claimed that such American citizens, with their descendants, are subjects of foreign States, owing allegiance to the Governments thereof;" and that "it is necessary to the maintenance of public peace that this claim of foreign allegiance to the Governments thereof should be promptly and finally disavowed."

The Bill, as finally passed by the House of Representatives, enacted "that all naturalized citizens of the United States, while in foreign States, shall be entitled to and shall receive protection of persons and property that is accorded to native-born citizens in like situations and circumstances.

"And whenever it shall be duly made known to the President that any citizen of the United States has been arrested, and is detained by any foreign Government in contravention of the intent and purposes of this Act, upon the allegation that naturalization in the United States does not operate to dissolve his allegiance to his native Sovereign; or if any citizen shall have been arrested and detained, whose release upon demand shall have been unreasonably delayed or refused, the President shall be and hereby is empowered to suspend in part, or wholly, commercial relations with the said Government, or, in case no other remedy is available, order the arrest, and to detain in custody, any subject or citizen of the said foreign Government who may be found within the jurisdiction of the United States, except Ambassadors and other public Ministers and their domestics and domestic servants, and who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States; and the President shall, without delay, give information to Congress of any such proceedings under this Act."

On the 24th of February the House of Representatives adopted a resolution by 126 votes against 41 to impeach the President, Mr. Johnson, of high crimes and misdemeanours, and appointed Mr. Thaddeus Stevens and Mr. Bingham, of Ohio, as a committee to impeach him at the Bar of the Senate. Messrs. Stevens, Boutwell, Bingham, Wilson, Logan, and Ward were selected as the Committee to prepare the articles of impeachment.

President Johnson sent a Message to the Senate in which he stated that the Tenure of Office Act prohibited the removal without the consent of the Senate of any Cabinet officer during the term of office of the President by whom he was appointed. He did not appoint Mr. Stanton, and therefore his removal was no violation of the Act. But all the Cabinet, including Mr. Stanton, had

pronounced the Tenure of Office Act to be unconstitutional, and he wished the matter to be tested by the Courts of the nation. He had honestly endeavoured to discharge his solemn obligation to defend the Constitution and the high office entrusted to him. He had acted with great circumspection, but regardless of consequences to himself.

At the end of February the Committee reported to the House of Representatives that they had agreed upon the articles of impeachment. The first of them charged the President with violating the Tenure of Office Act by removing Mr. Stanton from the Office of Secretary of War without the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States. The order complained of was in the following terms :—

“Executive Mansion, Washington, D.C., Feb. 21, 1868.

“Sir,—By virtue of the power and authority vested in me, as President, by the Constitution and laws of the United States, you are hereby removed from the office of Secretary for the Department of War, and your functions as such will terminate upon receipt of this communication. You will transfer to Brevet Major-General L. Thomas, Adjutant-General of the Army, who has this day been authorized and empowered to act as Secretary of War *ad interim*, all books, papers and other public property now in your custody and charge.

“Respectfully yours,

“ANDREW JOHNSON.

“To the Hon. E. M. Stanton, Secretary of War.”

The other articles except the last varied the form of the charge. The last article charged the President with having told General Emery, who was in military command of the Department of Washington, that a certain Act, passed in March, 1867, “for making appropriations for the support of the army” was unconstitutional, and therefore not binding upon him as an officer of the army of the United States.

These articles were adopted by the House, and Messrs. Thaddeus Stevens, Butler, Bingham, Boutwell, Wilson, Williams, and Logan were appointed managers of the impeachment. General Butler then proposed an additional article, which charges that the President had attempted “to bring into disgrace, ridicule, hatred, contempt and reproach the Congress of the United States; . . . and in pursuance of his said design and intent, openly and publicly, and before divers assemblages of citizens of the United States, convened in divers parts thereof, to meet and receive the said Andrew Johnson as the Chief Magistrate of the United States, did, on the eighteenth day of August, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six, and on divers other days and times, as well before as afterwards, make and declare, with a loud voice, certain intemperate, inflammatory and scandalous harangues, and therein utter loud threats and bitter menaces, as well against Congress

as the laws of the United States duly enacted thereby, amid the cries, jeers and laughter of the multitudes then assembled in hearing."

The article then quoted long passages from several speeches made by the President, in one of which he had said, "We have seen hanging upon the verge of the Government, as it were, a body called, or which assumes to be, the Congress of the United States, while in fact it is a Congress of only part of the States. We have seen this Congress pretend to be for the Union, when its every step and act tended to perpetuate disunion and make a disruption of States inevitable. We have seen Congress gradually encroach, step by step, upon constitutional rights, and violate day after day, and month after month, fundamental principles of the Government. We have seen a Congress that seemed to forget that there was a limit to the sphere and scope of legislation. We have seen a Congress in a minority assume to exercise power which, if allowed to be consummated, would result in despotism or monarchy itself."

In another, "I know that I have been traduced and abused. I know it has come in advance of me here, as elsewhere, that I have attempted to exercise an arbitrary power in resisting laws that were intended to be forced upon the Government; that I had exercised that power; that I had abandoned the party that elected me, and that I was a traitor, because I exercised the veto power in attempting, and did arrest for a time, that which was called a 'Freedmen's Bureau' Bill. Yes, that I was a traitor. And I have been traduced; I have been slandered; I have been maligned; I have been called Judas Iscariot, and all that. Now, my countrymen, here to-night, it is very easy to indulge in epithets; it is easy to call a man a Judas, and cry out traitor, but when he is called upon to give arguments and facts he is very often found wanting. Judas Iscariot—Judas! There was a Judas, and he was one of the twelve Apostles. Oh, yes, the twelve Apostles had a Christ, and He never could have had a Judas unless He had twelve Apostles. If I have played the Judas who has been my Christ that I have played the Judas with? Was it Thad. Stevens? Was it Wendell Phillips? Was it Charles Sumner? They are the men that stop and compare themselves with the Saviour, and every body that differs with them in opinion, and tries to stay and arrest their diabolical and nefarious policy, is to be denounced as a Judas. Well, let me say to you, if you will stand by me in this action, if * you will stand by me in trying to give the people a fair chance—soldiers and citizens—to participate in these offices, God be willing, I will kick them out. I will kick them out just as fast as I can. Let me say to you, in concluding, that what I have said is what I intended to say; I was not provoked into this, and care not for their menaces, the taunts and the jeers. I care not for threats, I do not intend to be bullied by enemies, nor overawed by my friends. But, God willing, with your help, I will veto their measures whenever any of them come to me."

This article was adopted, and also another which charged that the President had declared and affirmed, in substance, that the thirty-ninth Congress of the United States was not a Congress authorized to exercise legislative power, but, on the contrary, was a Congress of only part of the States. Chief Justice Chase was appointed President of the Senate as the Court for the trial, and on the 18th of March President Johnson appeared and delivered in a statement by his counsel, who were Messrs. Stanbery, Curtis, Black, Evarts, and Nelson, demanding more time to answer the charges. This was refused, and on the 23rd of March the President put in his answer, which was a very long document denying *seriatim* that he was guilty of the several charges brought against him. Next day the managers presented their replication, and on the 30th of March the case for the impeachment was opened by Mr. Butler. We do not purpose to go through the details of the trial, which lasted until the 16th of May. Many witnesses were examined, and some very able speeches were delivered on both sides, but conspicuous amongst them all was that of Mr. Evarts (who became Attorney-General of the United States) for the defence. The result was that a vote was first taken on the 16th of May, on the question of the 11th article of the impeachment, when thirty-five of the Senators voted for a conviction, and nineteen for an acquittal. This was, in effect, an acquittal by the Senate, as it was necessary that two-thirds should vote for a conviction to sustain a verdict of guilty. The Senate then adjourned "as a Court of Impeachment" until the 26th of May, when the votes were taken on the other charges, and the President was acquitted upon all of them.

The following was the manifesto or "platform" adopted by the Republican party at a Convention held at Chicago on the 20th of May:—

"1. We congratulate the country on the assured success of the reconstruction projects of Congress, as evinced by the adoption in a majority of the States lately in rebellion of constitutions securing equal civil and political rights to all, and regard it as the duty of the Government to sustain these institutions, and to prevent the people of such States from being remitted to a state of anarchy.

"2. The guarantee of Congress of equal suffrage to all loyal men at the South was demanded by every consideration of public safety, of gratitude, and of justice, and must be maintained, while the question of suffrage in all the loyal States properly belongs to the people of these States.

"3. We denounce all forms of repudiation as a national crime, and national honour requires the payment of the public indebtedness in the utmost good faith to all creditors at home and abroad, not only according to the letter but the spirit of the laws under which it was contracted.

"4. It is due to the labour of the nation that taxation should be equalized and reduced as rapidly as possible as the national faith will permit.

"5. The national debt, contracted, as it has been, for the preservation of the Union for all time to come, should be extended over a fair period for redemption, and it is the duty of Congress to reduce the rate of interest thereon whenever it can honestly be done.

"6. That the best policy to diminish our burden of debt is to so improve our credit that capitalists will seek to loan us money at lower rates of interest than we now pay and continue to pay so long as repudiation, partial or total, open or covert, is threatened or suspected.

"7. The Government of the United States should be administered with the strictest economy, and the corruptions which have been so shamefully nursed and fostered by Andrew Johnson calls loudly for radical reform.

"8. We profoundly deplore the untimely and tragic death of Abraham Lincoln, and regret the accession of Andrew Johnson to the presidency, who has acted treacherously to the people who elected him and the cause he was pledged to support; has usurped the legislative and judicial functions; has refused to execute the laws; has used his high office to induce other officers to ignore and violate the laws; has employed the executive power to render insecure the prosperity, peace, and liberty of life of the citizens; has abused the pardoning power; has denounced the national Legislature as unconstitutional; has persistently and corruptly resisted, by every measure in his power, every proper attempt at the reconstruction of the States lately in rebellion, has perverted the public patronage into an engine of wholesale corruption, and has been justly impeached for high crimes and misdemeanours, and properly pronounced guilty by the votes of thirty-five senators.

"9. The doctrine of Great Britain and other European Powers, that because a man is once a subject he is always so, must be resisted at every hazard by the United States as a relic of the feudal times, not authorized by the law of nations and at war with our national honour and independence. Naturalized citizens are entitled to be protected in all their rights of citizenship as though they were native born, and no citizen of the United States, native or naturalized, must be liable to arrest and imprisonment by any foreign Power for acts done or words spoken in this country; and if so arrested and imprisoned, it is the duty of the Government to interfere in his behalf.

"10. Of all who were faithful in the trials of the late war there were none entitled to more especial honour than the brave soldiers and seamen who endured the hardships of campaign and cruise, and imperilled their lives in the service of the country. The bounties and pensions provided by law for these brave defenders of the nation are obligations never to be forgotten. The widows and orphans of the gallant dead are the wards of the people—a sacred legacy bequeathed to the nation's protecting care.

"11. Foreign immigration, which in the past has added so much to the wealth and development of the resources and the

increase of power to this nation—"the asylum of the oppressed of all nations"—should be fostered and encouraged by a liberal and just policy.

"12. This Convention declares its sympathy with all the oppressed people who are struggling for their rights."

In the month of June the President transmitted to the Senate for their approval his nomination of Mr. Reverdy Johnson, a Senator, as Minister to England in the place of Mr. Adams, who had resigned. The Senate, as a mark of respect to Mr. Johnson, dispensed with the usual formality of a reference to a Committee, and confirmed the appointment without any opposition.

A Bill for re-admitting Arkansas into the Union with a proviso as a condition that the State of Arkansas shall never deprive any citizen or class of citizens of the right to vote who are now entitled to vote by the new State Constitution, except as a punishment for crime, having been passed by Congress, was vetoed by the President. In his message explaining his reasons, he said that an approval of this Bill by him would be an admission on the part of the Executive that the various Reconstruction Bills were proper and constitutional. His opinion, however, in reference to those measures had undergone no change, but, on the contrary, had been strengthened by the results which had attended their execution. Even were this the case he could not consent to a Bill based upon the assumption either that by an act of rebellion of a portion of the people the State of Arkansas seceded from the Union, or that Congress might, at its pleasure, expel or exclude a State from the Union, or interrupt the Government by arbitrarily depriving it of representation in the Senate and House of Representatives. After reciting the provisions of the Federal Constitution in regard to the representation of the States in Congress, Mr. Johnson, following that authority, declared that all that was necessary to restore Arkansas in all its constitutional relations to the Government was a decision by each House upon the eligibility of those who, presenting their credentials, claimed seats in the respective Houses of Congress. He went on to protest against the authority assumed by Congress to regulate the franchise in Arkansas, by imposing as a fundamental condition to the representation of that State that the basis of suffrage therein should never be changed from that laid down in the new State Constitution, saying that the question of suffrage was reserved by the Federal Constitution to the States themselves. He did not forget to call attention to the fact that in imposing this condition the Bill failed to provide in what manner its acceptance should be signified, and that the Bill did not prescribe the penalty to follow a violation thereof, but left the people of Arkansas in uncertainty as to the consequences of such action. He noticed the circumstances under which the new Constitution was claimed to be adopted in Arkansas; the offensive test oath prescribed by the new Constitution to the voters, and which practically disfranchised large numbers who could have

voted under the Reconstruction Acts of Congress; and the small and doubtful majority claimed for the Constitution itself. He concluded by asking what was to be the consequence if Arkansas should hereafter modify her Constitution so as to conform it to those of a large proportion of the Northern and Western States. "Is it intended that a denial of representation shall follow, and if so, is there not reason to dread at some future day a recurrence of the troubles which have so long agitated the country? Would it not be the part of wisdom for Congress to take for a guide the Federal Constitution, rather than resort to measures which, looking only to the present, may in a few years renew, in an aggravated form, the strife and bitterness caused by legislation which has proved so ill-timed and unfortunate?"

The Bill, however, was passed against the veto by the requisite majorities of two-thirds in both Houses, and became law.

Another Bill, called "The Omnibus Bill," for re-admitting into the Union the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Louisiana, Florida, and Alabama was also passed about the same time. The omission of Alabama from the Bill had been urged by several Republican members on the ground that the Constitution there under the Reconstruction laws had not been ratified by a majority of registered voters; but the objection was not allowed to prevail. The Bill was of course vetoed by the President, and of course passed afterwards in spite of it by the requisite majorities¹.

¹ The estimated balance-sheet for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1869, was as follows:—

RECEIPTS.

From Customs	\$150,000,000
From Inland Revenue	122,120,000
From Public Land Sales	1,000,000
From Direct Tax	1,500,000
From Miscellaneous Sources	5,000,000
Preceding Year's Balance	42,000,000
Total Receipts for Year	\$321,620,000

EXPENDITURES.

Civil List	\$51,000,000
Pensions and Indians	85,000,000
Army and Bounty Fund	135,000,000
Navy	47,317,186
Debt Interest	130,000,000
Alaska, in gold	7,200,000
Private Appropriations	583,669
Deficiencies of former Years (Appropriations)	19,275,706
Principal of Loans of 1847-8, now due	8,582,641
Preceding Year's Expenses	42,000,000
Post-office Deficiency	6,100,000
Total	\$482,059,202

From this it appears that there will be a deficit of \$160,439,262. By an Act of Congress passed in April, 1866, any increase of the Public Debt was prohibited beyond \$2,827,000,000, which was its amount at that time.

CHAPTER VI.

UNITED STATES (*continued*).

Proclamation by the President granting an Amnesty—Manifesto of the Democratic Party—Bill to prevent Southern States not reorganized under the Reconstruction Laws from voting in the Electoral Colleges—Message from the President as to Election of Senators—Report of a Committee of the House of Representatives on the question of taxing Interest on Public Bonds—Negroes declared by the Legislature of Georgia disqualified to sit as Members—Recognition of the new Spanish Government—Contest for the Presidency—General Grant and Mr. Horatio Seymour—Tone of the Press in the United States—General Grant elected President—Opening of new Session of Congress—Message of the President—*Topics*:—1. Reconstruction Question—2. Tenure of Office Bill—3. Finances—4. Public Debt—5. Currency—6. Public Lands—7. Indians—8. War Department—9. Navy—10. Foreign Relations—11. Amendments to the Constitution recommended—Resolution by House of Representatives as to Public Debt.

IN the beginning of July the President issued a proclamation granting a free pardon to all who participated in the rebellion except those who, at the time of publishing the proclamation, had indictments found against them for treason-felony.

The Democratic party met in convention in New York in July, and issued the following as their "platform":—

"The Democratic party, in National Convention assembled, reposing its trust in the intelligence, patriotism, and discriminating justice of the people, standing upon the Constitution as the foundation and limitation of the powers of the Government, and the guarantee of the liberties of the citizens, and recognizing the questions of slavery and secession as having been settled for all time to come by the war or the voluntary action of the Southern States in Constitutional Conventions assembled, and never to be renewed or reargitated, do with the return of peace demand,—

"1. Immediate restoration of all the States to their rights in the Union under the Constitution, and of civil government to the American people.

"2. Amnesty for all past political offences, and the regulation of the elective franchise in the States by their citizens.

• "3. Payment of the Public Debt of the United States as rapidly as practicable, all moneys drawn from the people by taxation, except so much as is requisite for the necessities of the Government economically administered, being honestly applied to such payment, and where the obligations of the Government do not expressly state upon their face, or the law under which they were issued does not provide, that they shall be paid in coin, they ought, in right and in justice, to be paid in the lawful money of the United States.

"4. Equal taxation of every species of property according to its real value, including bonds and other public securities.

"5. One currency for the Government and the people, the
S

labourer and the officeholder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder.

"6. Economy in the administration of the Government; the reduction of the standing army and navy; the abolition of the Freedmen's Bureau, and all political instrumentalities designed to secure negro supremacy, simplification of the system and discontinuance of inquisitorial modes of assessing and collecting internal revenue, so that the burden of taxation may be equalized and lessened, the credit of the Government and the currency made good, the repeal of all enactments for enrolling the State militia into national forces in time of peace, and a tariff for revenue upon foreign imports, and such equal taxation under the Internal Revenue laws as will afford incidental protection to domestic manufactures, and as will, without impairing the revenue, impose the least burden upon and best promote and encourage the great industrial interests of the country.

"7. Reform of abuses in the administration, the expulsion of corrupt men from office, the abrogation of useless offices, the restoration of rightful authority to and the independence of the executive and judicial departments of the Government, the subordination of the military to the civil power, to the end that the usurpations of Congress and the despotism of the sword may cease.

"8. Equal rights and protection for naturalized and native-born citizens at home and abroad; the assertion of American nationality, which shall command the respect of foreign Powers, and furnish an example and encouragement to people struggling for national integrity, constitutional liberty, and individual rights; and the maintenance of the rights of naturalized citizens against the absolute doctrine of immutable allegiance, and the claims of foreign Powers to punish them for alleged crime committed beyond their jurisdiction.

"In demanding these measures and reforms we arraign the Radical party for its disregard of right, and the unparalleled oppression and tyranny which have marked its career.

"After the most solemn and unanimous pledge of both Houses of Congress to prosecute the war exclusively for the maintenance of the Government and the preservation of the Union under the Constitution, it has repeatedly violated that most sacred pledge under which alone was rallied that noble volunteer army which carried our flag to victory.

"Instead of restoring the Union, it has, so far as in its power, dissolved it, and subjected ten States in time of profound peace to military despotism and negro supremacy. It has nullified there the right of trial by jury; it has abolished the *Habeas Corpus*, that most sacred writ of liberty; it has overthrown the freedom of speech and the press; it has substituted arbitrary seizures and arrests, and military trials, and secret Star Chamber inquisitions for the constitutional tribunals; it has disregarded in time of peace

the right of the people to be free from searches and seizures; it has entered the post and telegraph offices, and even the private rooms of individuals, and seized their private papers and letters without any specific charge or notice of affidavit, as required by the organic law; it has converted the American Capitol into a Bastille; it has established a system of spies and official espionage to which no constitutional monarchy of Europe would now dare to resort; it has abolished the right of appeal on important constitutional questions to the supreme judicial tribunals, and threatens to curtail or destroy its original jurisdiction, which is irrevocably vested by the Constitution; while the learned Chief Justice has been subjected to the most atrocious calumnies merely because he would not prostitute his high office to the support of the false and partisan charges preferred against the President. Its corruption and extravagance have exceeded any thing known in history, and by its frauds and monopolies it has nearly doubled the burden of the debt created by the war. It has stripped the President of his constitutional power of appointment, even of his own Cabinet. Under its repeated assaults the pillars of the Government are rocking on their base, and should it succeed in November next and inaugurate its President, we will meet as a subject and conquered people amid the ruins of liberty and the scattered fragments of the Constitution.

"And we do declare and resolve that ever since the people of the United States threw off all subjection to the British Crown the privilege and trust of suffrage have belonged to the several States, and have been granted, regulated, and controlled exclusively by the political power of each State respectively, and that any attempt by Congress, on any pretext whatever, to deprive any State of this right, or interfere with its exercise, is a flagrant usurpation of power, which can find no warrant in the Constitution; and if sanctioned by the people will subvert our form of Government, and can only end in a single centralized and consolidated Government, on which the separate existence of the States will be entirely absorbed and an unqualified despotism be established in place of a Federal Union of co-equal States; and that we regard the Reconstruction Acts (so called) of Congress, as such, as usurpations and unconstitutional, revolutionary and void; that our soldiers and sailors who carried the flag of our country to victory against a most gallant and determined foe must ever be gratefully remembered, and all the guarantees given in their favour must be faithfully carried into execution.

"That the public lands should be distributed as widely as possible among the people, and should be disposed of under the pre-emption of homestead lands, and sold in reasonable quantities, and to none but actual occupants, at the *minimum* price established by the Government. When grants of the public lands may be allowed necessary for the encouragement of important public improvements, the proceeds of the sale of such lands, and not the lands themselves, should be so applied.

"That the President of the United States, Andrew Johnson, in exercising the power of his high office in resisting the aggressions of Congress upon the constitutional rights of the States and the people, is entitled to the gratitude of the whole American people, and in behalf of the Democratic party we tender him our thanks for his patriotic efforts in that regard. Upon this platform the Democratic party appeal to every patriot, including all the Conservative element, and all who desire to support the Constitution and restore the Union, forgetting all past differences of opinion, to unite with us in the present great struggle for the liberties of the people; and that to all such, to whatever party they may have heretofore belonged, we extend the right hand of fellowship, and hail all such co-operating with us as friends and brethren.

"Resolved,—That in the future as in the past we will adhere with unwavering fidelity to the Union under the Constitution as the only solid foundation of our strength, security, and happiness as a people, and as a framework of government equally conducive to the welfare and prosperity of all the States both Northern and Southern.

"Resolved,—That the Union established by the Constitution is a Union of States, Federal in its character, composed of States thereby united, and is incapable of existence without the States as its continuing integral parts, and therefore the perpetuation of the Union in its integrity depends upon the preservation of the States in their political integrity, the Government of the United States being a Federal Republic, and not a consolidation of the whole people into a nation.

"Resolved,—That the perpetuation of the Union and the maintenance of the Government as both were established by the Constitution, and as both under the Constitution have been expounded in the foregoing resolutions in conformity with the venerable teachings of Jefferson, Madison, and Jackson, have ever been held as cardinal doctrines of the Democratic party; and they are now reiterated with increased earnestness under the solemn conviction that they can be effected only by bringing back the administration of the Government to the time-honoured principles on which for sixty years there was such unparalleled happiness and prosperity, and by rescuing it from those who have ever held the Constitution itself to be no better than a 'covenant with death, and an agreement with hell,' whose revolutionary policy and measures have brought such general discord, strife, and war, with its attendant ills, upon a large portion of the country, and such widespread demoralization throughout the whole of it.

"Resolved,—That the Democratic party, in sustaining the Federal Administration in the late unhappy conflict of arms, did so in good faith, with the hope and earnest wish to maintain the principles above set forth, and with no view of 'waging war' on the part of the Northern States 'in any spirit of oppression' against their brethren of the South, nor for any purpose of conquest or subjugation.

tion, nor purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of the States; but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired. The subjugation of these States, or the holding of them as conquered territory, would be, in the judgment of this Convention, the destruction of the Union itself.

“Resolved,—That the highest meed of patriotism is due, and should ever be rendered, to all those who in the recent war perilled life or fortune for the maintenance of the Union and the beneficent system of American government thereby established upon the fundamental principles set forth in the foregoing resolutions; but we have neither thanks nor sympathy for those who entered or carried on the contest for the subjugation of States, or for the subjugation by Federal authority of the white race in any of the States to the dominion of the blacks. The right of suffrage, or who shall exercise political power, is a matter that rests under the Constitution exclusively with the several States. There it properly belongs, and there it should continue ever to remain.”

At the same time they nominated as the Democratic candidates for the offices of President and Vice-President Mr. Horatio Seymour, ex-Governor of New York, and General Blair.

A Bill was passed in July by Congress to prohibit such of the Southern States as should not have reorganized themselves under the Reconstruction Laws from voting in the Electoral Colleges for the President and Vice-President in the ensuing election. This Bill was vetoed by the President, but passed by the requisite majorities in both Houses, and became law. In his message to Congress, explaining his reasons for the veto, the President said that the mode of receiving and counting the electoral votes was plainly prescribed by the Constitution, and that Congress had no power to revise or reject the votes. He directed attention to a declaration in the Bill that none of the States whose inhabitants were lately in rebellion should be entitled to representation in the Electoral College, and said, if it was meant that no State was to be allowed to vote for President and Vice-President all of whose inhabitants were engaged in the rebellion, it was apparent that none of the States would be excluded from voting, since many of the inhabitants of every Southern State refrained from participating in the rebellion. He therefore concluded the true meaning to be that no State, a portion of whose inhabitants were engaged in the rebellion, should be permitted to vote in the Presidential election, except upon the terms prescribed, and asked, might not those Northern States, where a portion of the inhabitants were actually in the rebellion, be prevented at the discretion of Congress from having their electoral votes counted? It was well known that a portion of the inhabitants of New York and a portion of those of Virginia were alike engaged in the rebellion. If Congress could exclude Virginia from the Electoral College, it could exclude New

York or any other of the States. Thus the result of the Presidential election might be controlled and determined by Congress, and the people be deprived of their right under the Constitution to choose a President and Vice-President of the United States. It was a radical error to suppose that Congress had the power to prescribe terms and conditions to this right of the people of the States.

Mr. Seward, Secretary of State, issued a proclamation announcing that twenty-nine States having ratified the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution it had become part of the Constitution, "if the resolutions of the Legislatures of Ohio and New Jersey ratifying the aforesaid amendment are to be deemed as remaining of full force and effect, notwithstanding the subsequent resolutions of the Legislatures of those States, which purport to withdraw the consent of said States from said ratification."

In July President Johnson sent a message to Congress recommending a constitutional amendment providing that the President be elected by direct popular vote for a term of six years, and be ineligible a second term, and that Senators be elected by the people instead of by a vote of the Legislature.

In July a resolution was carried in the House of Representatives instructing the Committee of Ways and Means to report a Bill for taxing the interest on the bonds of the United States at 10 per cent. The Committee accordingly did report the Bill, but stated that they did so only in obedience to the positive order of the House, and were themselves opposed to the proposal. They said, "In the argument made in the House in favour of the resolution the English income-tax law was referred to and quoted. There is a law corresponding to that English law in this country, imposing a tax of 5 per cent. on incomes, while the English law imposes 3. But your Committee have been unable to find on the statute-books of England or any other civilized country a law that could be regarded in any way as a precedent for the Bill the House have instructed the Committee to report, which, if enacted, will be simply a law providing for the payment of a rate of interest on the Government debt 10 per cent. less than was agreed, for 10 per cent. less than is stated in the bonds, and 10 per cent. less than was pledged to be paid by the solemn enactment of Congress, when the money was required to carry on a war which threatened the life of the nation. The evil effects resulting to a nation, whether her national credit is guarded and protected, or whether, by legislation of the character now proposed, the confidence of all other civilized nations is forfeited, may not be felt or appreciated in time of peace, but the Committee desire to call attention to the consequences that would follow the passage of a Bill of the character now submitted in case we should ever hereafter have occasion to use our credit for the purpose of providing means either to sustain ourselves at home or to defend ourselves in any collision with a foreign Power."

In Georgia the House of Representatives, in September, by a majority of eighty to twenty-three, declared that negroes returned to the Legislature as members were disqualified.

When the news of the Insurrection in Spain reached the United States, and a telegram informed Mr. Secretary Seward that General Serrano had entered Madrid "heading his victorious army," he telegraphed, on the 5th of October, to the American Minister as follows:—"If the new National Government is peacefully established, and in full possession of Madrid, and there remains no contending Government in Spain, you will recognize the new Government *de facto*, so as to prosecute any necessary business affecting the Government of the United States or their citizens." And afterwards, "Reciprocate, in the President's name, the salutation of the Provisional Government, communicated by the Spanish Minister here, and tender the best wishes of the United States for the peace, prosperity, and happiness of Spain under the present and definitive Governments."

The absorbing subject of interest in the United States during the autumn was the contest for the Presidency. The Republicans nominated General Grant as their candidate for the office, and Mr. Schuyler Colfax (the Speaker of the House of Representatives) for the Vice-Presidency. While the Democratic candidates respectively were Mr. Horatio Seymour and General Blair. As has been before explained in one of our previous volumes, the President and Vice-President in the United States are not chosen directly by the people, but through the medium of "Electors," and each State is entitled to as many Electors as it has Senators and representatives in Congress. There are now thirty-seven States in the American Union; each of them has two Senators, making seventy-four in all, and a number of representatives varying according to population, the whole number being 243. The entire Electoral College therefore consists of seventy-four added to 243, or 317 Electors in all, and a majority of this number, 159, is necessary to elect. We may also mention that the Senate is elected for six years (one-third resigning their seats every two years), and the House of Representatives for two years; but the general elections are not deferred, as in England, until the existing Congress has come to an end. Each State determines for itself the period at which it elects members of Congress or the Senate before the vacancies have actually occurred; and consequently, as the House of Representatives was approaching its term of duration, elections of members for the next Congress took place at various periods in the different States during the autumn. The result was so far favourable to the Democrats that they increased their strength and diminished their minority¹. But the party which secures the majority of the

¹ It was computed that in the next Congress there would be in the Senate 58 Republicans as against 56, and 10 Democrats as against 12 in the present; and in

whole votes in a State elects the entire delegation of "Electors" for the offices of President and Vice-President from that State, so that the electoral vote of a State is not divided, but given bodily for one or the other pair of the rival candidates.

General Grant is a man who acts upon the maxim that "if speaking is silver, silence is gold," and we believe that he made no public speeches during the Presidential campaign. But Mr.

the House of Representatives 145 Republicans as against 174, and 82 Democrats as against 52 in the present.

NORTHERN STATES.

	Senate.				House.			
	Present Congress. Rep.	Dem.	Next Congress. Rep.	Dem.	Present Congress. Rep.	Dem.	Next Congress. Rep.	Dem.
California	2	—	1	1	1	2	2	1
Connecticut	1	1	2	—	1	3	2	2
Delaware	—	2	—	2	—	1	—	1
Illinois	2	—	2	—	11	3	11	3
Indiana	1	1	2	—	8	3	7	4
Iowa	2	—	2	—	6	—	6	—
Kansas	2	—	2	—	1	—	1	—
Kentucky	—	2	—	2	1	8	—	9
Maine	2	—	2	—	5	—	5	—
Maryland	—	2	—	2	1	4	—	5
Massachusetts	2	—	2	—	10	—	10	—
Michigan	2	—	2	—	6	—	6	—
Minnesota	1	1	1	1	2	—	1	1
Missouri	2	—	2	—	8	1	5	4
Nebraska	2	—	2	—	1	—	1	—
Nevada	2	—	2	—	1	—	1	—
New Hampshire	2	—	2	—	3	—	3	—
New Jersey	2	—	1	1	3	2	2	3
New York	2	—	2	—	21	10	18	13
Ohio	2	—	1	1	16	3	13	6
Oregon	2	—	2	—	1	—	1	—
Pennsylvania	1	1	2	—	18	6	15	9
Rhode Island	2	—	2	—	2	—	2	—
Tennessee	1	1	2	—	8	—	9	—
Vermont	2	—	2	—	3	—	3	—
West Virginia	2	—	2	—	3	—	3	—
Wisconsin	1	1	2	—	5	1	5	1
Total North ...	42	12	44	10	146	47	131	63

SOUTHERN STATES*.

Alabama	2	—	2	—	6	—	3	3
Arkansas	2	—	2	—	3	—	1	2
Florida	2	—	2	—	1	—	1	—
Georgia	2	—	2	—	4	3	2	5
Louisiana	2	—	2	—	4	1	—	5
North Carolina ..	2	—	2	—	3	1	4	3
South Carolina ..	2	—	2	—	4	—	3	1
Total South ...	14	—	14	—	28	5	14	19
Grand Totals ..	56	12	58	10	174	52	145	82

* There is no representation from Texas, Virginia, or Mississippi.

Seymour was not so reticent, and he addressed numerous meetings. At one of them, at Rochester, he said, "I ask those who in their hearts seek the welfare of our land and the permanence of our institutions, if it is well and safe for another four years to give unrestrained, unchanged, and unqualified power to those who have failed during the past four years to bring our affairs into a satisfactory condition? We do not ask you to give us unrestricted power. You could not if you would. All you can do at this election is to place some one in the Executive chair who can check the excesses of the Congressional party; and to administer a rebuke to those who, giving way to passion, and acting upon the policy of hate and discord, have prolonged the difficulties of our country, have continued its burdens of taxation, have oppressed its labour, and have made its people uncertain as to the future. I trust that when this election shall have terminated it shall be the judgment of the people of the United States that the intention of the framers of our Constitution shall be carried out; that power shall in such degree be divided between the great political organizations, that they can hold each other in check; and that it shall neither be in the power of the Republican nor of the Democratic party to plunge our country into the evils of civil war, even if they could find it in their hearts to do a thing so unwise, so wicked, and so unpatriotic."

The tone of the press in the United States is much lower than could be believed of a country where there is so much educated intelligence amongst the people. It is little to say that it offends against good taste. With a few honourable exceptions it indulges in violent personal attacks—caricaturing in the coarsest terms political opponents—and prying into the details of private life for the purpose of damaging public character. We firmly believe that it does not fairly represent the feeling of the nation; and most certainly is not the reflex of the views of the higher classes, who ought to give the tone to public opinion, but who, unhappily, in America, find themselves almost powerless to guide it, and, as a general rule, abstain from taking an active part in politics where they know that they would be swamped by the overwhelming tide of universal suffrage. During the contest for the Presidency in the autumn of this year, most violent articles appeared in the newspapers on both sides, and we will quote one or two passages to give an idea of the kind of attacks in which what has been called "the best possible instructor of the people" indulged. A Republican paper said that if the Democratic candidate for the office of Governor of Missouri were elected "there would be an immigration of murderers and banished rebels from Arkansas, who will drive all well-meaning men from that part of the State."

A Democratic paper told its readers thus to treat the Republicans who came to the South to support General Grant: "Dig a social grave for their putrid carcasses, so deep that the earthquakes of ten centuries would not disturb their cursed bones; and

while they live let their children huddle together and the women shrink in horror as passes near them the ghastly ghoul who was a 'scallawag.'"

Another said, "Let us impress upon these mongrelized scoundrels (the Republicans) the very solemn fact, that while Democrats will break no peace, they are fully resolved, if need be, to break the heads of those who take any further illegal and violent steps for turning this country into a vile negroes' nest, upon the blackened ruins of the once free white man's Government, founded by our fathers."

The vote for the "Electors" was taken on the 3rd of November, and the result was that the Republicans carried their candidates, General Grant and Mr. Colfax, by a large majority. Twenty-one of the Northern States and four of the Southern voted for them, while six of the Northern States and three of the Southern voted for Seymour and Blair. Texas, East Virginia, and Mississippi, being still excluded by the Reconstruction Laws, did not vote¹.

The last Session of the fortieth Congress of the United States began on the 7th of December, and two days afterwards President Johnson sent his annual message. It was of great length, and the following are the passages of chief interest and importance:—

"FELLOW-CITIZENS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:—

"Upon the reassembling of Congress it again becomes my duty to call your attention to the state of the Union, and to its continued disorganized condition under the various laws which have been passed upon the subject of reconstruction.

"It may be safely assumed as an axiom in the government of States that the greatest wrongs inflicted upon a people are caused by unjust and arbitrary legislation, or by the unrelenting decrees of despotic rulers, and that the timely revocation of injurious and oppressive measures is the greatest good that can be conferred upon a nation. The legislator or ruler who has the wisdom and magnanimity to retrace his steps, when convinced of error, will sooner or later be rewarded with the respect and gratitude of an intelligent and patriotic people.

"THE RECONSTRUCTION QUESTION.

"Our own history, although embracing a period less than a century, affords abundant proof that most, if not all, of our domestic troubles are directly traceable to violations of the organic law and excessive legislation. The most striking illustrations of this fact are furnished by the enactments of the past three years upon the question of reconstruction. After a fair trial they have substantially failed and proved pernicious in their results, and there

¹ In Newark, New Jersey, two ladies presented themselves at one of the polling places and claimed a right to vote, but were refused.

seems no good reason why they should longer remain upon the statute-book. States to which the Constitution guarantees a Republican form of government have been reduced to military dependencies, in each of which the people have been made subject to the arbitrary will of the commanding General. Although the Constitution requires that each State shall be represented in Congress, Virginia, Mississippi, and Texas are yet excluded from the two Houses; and, contrary to the express provisions of that instrument, were denied participation in the recent election for a President and Vice-President of the United States.

“The attempt to place the white population under the dominion of persons of colour in the South has impaired, if not destroyed, the kindly relations that had previously existed between them, and mutual distrust has engendered a feeling of animosity which, leading in some instances to collision and bloodshed, has prevented that co-operation between the two races so essential to the success of industrial enterprises in the Southern States. Nor have the inhabitants of those States alone suffered from the disturbed condition of affairs growing out of these Congressional enactments. The entire Union has been agitated by grave apprehensions of troubles which might again involve the peace of the nation; its interests have been injuriously affected by the derangement of business and labour, and the consequent want of prosperity throughout that portion of the country.

“The Federal Constitution—the Magna Charta of American rights, under whose wise and salutary provisions we have successfully conducted all our domestic and foreign affairs, sustained ourselves in peace and in war, and become a great nation among the powers of the earth—must assuredly be now adequate to the settlement of questions growing out of the civil war waged alone for its vindication. This great fact is made most manifest by the condition of the country when Congress assembled in the month of December, 1865. Civil strife had ceased; the spirit of rebellion had spent its entire force; in the Southern States the people had warmed into national life, and throughout the country there had been a healthy reaction in public sentiment. By the application of the simple yet effective provisions of the Constitution the Executive Department, with the voluntary aid of the States, had brought the work of restoration as near completion as was within the scope of its authority, and the nation was encouraged by the prospect of an early and satisfactory adjustment of all its difficulties. Congress, however, intervened, and, refusing to perfect the work so nearly consummated, declined to admit members from the unrepresented States, adopted a series of measures which arrested the progress of restoration, frustrated all that had been so successfully accomplished, and, after three years of agitation and strife, has left the country further from the attainment of union and fraternal feeling than at the inception of the Congressional plan of reconstruction. It needs no argument to show that legislation which

has produced such baneful consequences should be abrogated, or else made to conform to the genuine principles of Republican Government.

"THE TENURE OF OFFICE BILL.

"Under the influence of party passion and sectional prejudice other Acts have been passed not warranted by the Constitution. Congress has already been made familiar with my views respecting the Tenure of Office Bill. Experience has proved that its repeal is demanded by the best interests of the country, and that while it remains in force the President cannot enjoin that rigid accountability of public officers so essential to an honest and efficient execution of the laws. Its revocation would enable the Executive Department to exercise the power of appointment and removal in accordance with the original design of the Federal Constitution.

"THE FINANCES.

"The condition of our finances demands the early and earnest consideration of Congress. Compared with the growth of our population the public expenditures have reached an amount unprecedented in our history.

"The population of the United States in 1790 was nearly four millions of people. Increasing each decade about 33 per cent. it reached in 1860 thirty-one millions—an increase of 700 per cent. on the population in 1790. In 1869 it is estimated that it will reach thirty-eight millions, or an increase of 868 per cent. in seventy-nine years.

"The annual expenditures of the Federal Government in 1791 were \$4,200,000; in 1820, \$18,200,000; in 1850, \$41,000,000; in 1860, \$63,000,000; in 1865, nearly \$1,300,000,000; and in 1869 it is estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his last annual report, that they will be \$372,000,000.

"By comparing the public disbursements of 1869, as estimated, with those of 1791, it will be seen that the increase of expenditure since the beginning of the Government has been 8,618 per centum, while the increase of the population for the same period was only 868 per centum. Again, the expenses of the Government in 1860, the year of peace immediately preceding the war, were only \$63,000,000, while in 1869, the year of peace three years after the war, it is estimated they will be \$372,000,000—an increase of 489 per centum, while the increase of population was only 21 per centum for the same period.

"These statistics further show that in 1791 the annual national expenses, compared with the population, were little more than one dollar per capita, and in 1860 but two dollars per capita; while in 1869 they will reach the extravagant sum of \$9 78c. per capita.

"It will be observed that all these statements refer to and exhibit the disbursements of peace periods. It may therefore be of interest to compare the expenditures of the three war periods

—the war with Great Britain, the Mexican war, and the war of the rebellion.

“In 1814 the annual expenses incident to the war of 1812 reached their highest amount, about \$31,000,000, while our population slightly exceeded 8,000,000, showing an expenditure of only \$3 80c. per capita. In 1847 the expenditures growing out of the war with Mexico reached \$55,000,000, and the population about 21,000,000, giving only \$2 60c. per capita for the war expenses of that year. In 1865 the expenditures called for by the rebellion reached the vast amount of \$1,290,000,000, which, compared with a population of 34,000,000, gives \$38 20c. per capita.

“From the 4th day of March, 1789, to the 30th of June, 1861, the entire expenditures of the Government were \$1,700,000,000. During that period we were engaged in wars with Great Britain and Mexico, and were involved in hostilities with powerful Indian tribes; Louisiana was purchased from France at a cost of \$15,000,000; Florida was ceded to us by Spain for \$5,000,000; California was acquired from Mexico for \$15,000,000, and the territory of New Mexico was obtained from Texas for the sum of \$10,000,000. Early in the spring of 1861 the war of the rebellion commenced, and from the 1st of July of that year to the 30th of June, 1865, the public expenditures reached the enormous aggregate of \$3,300,000,000. Three years of peace have intervened, and during that time the disbursements of the Government have successively been \$520,000,000, \$346,000,000, and \$393,000,000. Adding to these amounts \$372,000,000, estimated as necessary for the fiscal year ending the 30th of June 1869, we obtain a total expenditure of \$1,600,000,000 during the four years immediately succeeding the war, or nearly as much as was expended during the seventy-two years that preceded the rebellion, and embraced the extraordinary expenditures already named.

“These startling facts clearly illustrate the necessity of retrenchment in all branches of the public service. Abuses which were tolerated during the war for the preservation of the nation will not be endured by the people now that profound peace prevails. The receipts from internal revenues and customs have during the past three years gradually diminished, and the continuance of useless and extravagant expenditures will involve us in national bankruptcy, or else make inevitable an increase of taxes, already too onerous, and in many respects obnoxious on account of their inquisitorial character. One hundred millions annually are expended for the military force, a large portion of which is employed in the execution of laws both unnecessary and unconstitutional; \$150,000,000 are required each year to pay the interest on the public debt; an army of tax-gatherers impoverishes the nation; and public agents, placed by Congress beyond the control of the Executive, divert from their legitimate purposes large sums of money which they collect from the people in the name of the Government. Judicious legislation and prudent economy can

alone remedy defects and avert evils which, if suffered to exist, cannot fail to diminish confidence in the public councils and weaken the attachment and respect of the people towards their political institutions. Without proper care the small balance which it is estimated will remain in the Treasury at the close of the present fiscal year will not be realized, and additional millions will be added to a debt which is now enumerated by billions.

"It is shown by the able and comprehensive report of the Secretary of the Treasury that the receipts for the fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1868, were \$405,638,083, and that the expenditures for the same period were \$377,340,284—leaving in the Treasury a surplus of \$28,297,799. It is estimated that the receipts during the present fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1869, will be \$341,392,868, and the expenditures \$336,152,470, showing a small balance of \$5,240,398 in favour of the Government. For the fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1870, it is estimated that the receipts will amount to \$327,000,000 and the expenditures to \$303,000,000—leaving an estimated surplus of \$24,000,000.

"THE PUBLIC DEBT.

"It becomes proper in this connexion to make a brief reference to our public indebtedness, which has accumulated with such alarming rapidity and assumed such colossal proportions.

"In 1789, when the Government commenced operations under the Federal Constitution, it was burdened with an indebtedness of \$75,000,000, created during the war of the Revolution. This amount had been reduced to \$45,000,000 when, in 1812, war was declared against Great Britain. The three years' struggle that followed largely increased the national obligations, and in 1816 they had attained the sum of \$127,000,000. Wise and economical legislation, however, enabled the Government to pay the entire amount within a period of 20 years, and the extinguishment of the National Debt filled the land with rejoicing, and was one of the great events of President Jackson's administration. After its redemption, a large fund remained in the Treasury, which was deposited for safe keeping with the several States, on condition that it should be returned when required by the public wants. In 1849—the year after the termination of an expensive war with Mexico—we found ourselves involved in a debt of \$64,000,000; and this was the amount owed by the Government in 1860, just prior to the outbreak of the rebellion. In the spring of 1861 our civil war commenced. Each year of its continuance made an enormous addition to the debt; and when, in the spring of 1865, the nation successfully emerged from the conflict, the obligations of the Government had reached the immense sum of \$2,893,992,709. The Secretary of the Treasury shows that on the 1st day of November, 1867, this amount had been reduced to \$2,491,504,450; but at the same time his report exhibits an increase during the past year of \$35,625,102; for the

debt on the first day of November last is stated to have been \$2,527,129,552. It is estimated by the Secretary that the returns for the past month will add to our liabilities the further sum of \$11,000,000—making a total increase during 13 months of \$46,500,000.

“In my Message to Congress of December 4, 1865, it was suggested that a policy should be devised which, without being oppressive to the people, would at once begin to effect a reduction of the debt, and, if persisted in, discharge it fully within a definite number of years. The Secretary of the Treasury forcibly recommends legislation of this character, and justly urges that the longer it is deferred the more difficult must become its accomplishment. We should follow the wise precedents established in 1789 and 1816, and without further delay make provision for the payment of our obligations at as early a period as may be practicable. The fruits of their labours should be enjoyed by our citizens rather than used to build up and sustain monied monopolies in our own and other lands. Our foreign debt is already computed by the Secretary of the Treasury at \$850,000,000; citizens of foreign countries receive interest upon a large portion of our securities, and American taxpayers are made to contribute large sums for their support. The idea that such a debt is to become permanent should be at all times discarded, as involving taxation too heavy to be borne, and payment once in every sixteen years, at the present rate of interest, of an amount equal to the original sum.

“Various plans have been proposed for the payment of the public debt. However they may have varied as to the time and mode in which it should be redeemed, there seems to be a general concurrence as to the propriety and justness of a reduction in the present rate of interest. The Secretary of the Treasury in his report recommends 5 per cent.; Congress, in a Bill passed prior to adjournment on the 27th of July last, agreed upon 4 and 4½ per cent., while by many 3 per cent. has been held to be an amply sufficient return for the investment. The general impression as to the exorbitancy of the existing rate of interest has led to an inquiry in the public mind respecting the consideration which the Government has actually received for its bonds, and the conclusion is becoming prevalent that the amount which it obtained was in real money 300 or 400 per cent. less than the obligations which it issued in return. It cannot be denied that we are paying an extravagant percentage for the use of the money borrowed, which was paper currency greatly depreciated below the value of coin. This fact is made apparent when we consider that bondholders receive from the Treasury upon each dollar they own in Government securities 6 per cent. in gold, which is nearly or quite equal to 9 per cent. in currency; that the bonds are then converted into capital for the national banks, upon which those institutions issue their circulation, bearing 6 per cent. interest; and that they are exempt from taxation by the Government and the States, and

thereby enhanced 2 per cent. in the hands of the holders. We thus have an aggregate of 17 per cent. which may be received upon each dollar by the owners of Government securities. A system that produces such results is justly regarded as favouring a few at the expense of the many, and has led to the further inquiry whether our bondholders, in view of the large profits which they have enjoyed, would themselves be averse to a settlement of our indebtedness upon a plan which would yield them a fair remuneration, and at the same time be just to the tax-payers of the nation. Our national credit should be sacredly observed; but, in making provision for our creditors we should not forget what is due to the masses of the people. It may be assumed that the holders of our securities have already received upon their bonds a larger amount than their original investment, measured by a gold standard. Upon this statement of facts it would seem but just and equitable that the 6 per cent. interest now paid by the Government should be applied to the reduction of the principal in semi-annual instalments, which in sixteen years and eight months would liquidate the entire National Debt. Six per cent. in gold would at present rates be equal to 9 per cent. in currency, and equivalent to the payment of the debt one and a half times in a fraction less than seventeen years. This, in connexion with all the other advantages derived from their investment, would afford to the public creditors a fair and liberal compensation for the use of their capital, and with this they should be satisfied.

“THE CURRENCY.

“The proportion which the currency of any country should bear to the whole value of the annual produce circulated by its means is a question upon which political economists have not agreed. Nor can it be controlled by legislation, but must be left to the irrevocable laws which everywhere regulate commerce and trade. The circulating medium will ever irresistibly flow to those points where it is in greatest demand. The law of demand and supply is as unerring as that which regulates the tides of the ocean; and indeed currency, like the tides, has its ebbs and flows throughout the commercial world.

“At the beginning of the rebellion the bank-note circulation of the country amounted to not much more than two hundred millions of dollars; now the circulation of national bank-notes and those known as ‘legal tenders’ is nearly seven hundred millions. While it is urged by some that this amount should be increased, others contend that a decided reduction is absolutely essential to the best interests of the country. In view of these divers opinions, it may be well to ascertain the real value of our paper issues, when compared with a metallic or convertible currency. For this purpose, let us inquire how much gold and silver could be purchased by the seven hundred millions of paper money now in circulation. Probably not more than half the amount of the latter—showing that

when our paper currency is compared with gold and silver its commercial value is compressed into \$350,000,000. This striking fact makes it the obvious duty of the Government, as early as may be consistent with the principle of sound political economy, to take such measures as will enable the holders of its notes and those of the national banks to convert them without loss into specie or its equivalent. A reduction of our paper circulating medium need not necessarily follow. This, however, would depend upon the law of demand and supply, though it should be borne in mind that by making legal tender and bank-notes convertible into coin or its equivalent their present specie value in the hands of their holders would be enhanced 100 per cent. . . .

"The feasibility of making our currency correspond with the Constitutional standard may be seen by reference to a few facts derived from our commercial statistics.

"The aggregate product of precious metals in the United States from 1849 to 1867 amounted to \$1,174,000,000, while for the same period the net exports of specie were \$741,000,000. This shows an excess of product over net exports of \$433,000,000. There are in the Treasury \$103,407,985 in coin, in circulation in the States on the Pacific coast about \$40,000,000, and a few millions in the national and other banks—in all less than \$160,000,000. Taking into consideration the specie in the country prior to 1849 and that produced since 1867, and we have more than \$300,000,000 not accounted for by exportation or by the returns of the Treasury, and therefore most probably remaining in the country.

"These are important facts, and show how completely the inferior currency will supersede the better, forcing it from circulation among the masses, and causing it to be exported as a mere article of trade to add to the money capital of foreign lands. They show the necessity of retiring our paper money, that the return of gold and silver to the avenues of trade may be invited, and a demand created which will cause the retention at home of at least so much of the productions of our rich and inexhaustible gold-bearing fields as may be sufficient for purposes of circulation.

"Specie payments having been resumed by the Government and banks, all notes or bills of paper issued by either of a less denomination than twenty dollars should by law be excluded from circulation, so that the people may have the benefit and convenience of a gold and silver currency which in all their business transactions will be uniform in value at home and abroad.

"THE PUBLIC LANDS.—INDIANS.

"The Secretary of the Interior, in his report, gives valuable information in reference to the interests confided to the supervision of his department, and reviews the operations of the Land-office, Pension-office, Patent-office, and the Indian Bureau.

"During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1868, 6,655,700 acres of public land were disposed of. The entire cash receipts of the

General Land-office for the same period were \$81,632,745, being greater by \$284,883, than the amount realized from the same sources during the previous year. The entries under the homestead law cover 2,328,923 acres, nearly one-fourth of which was taken under the Act of June 21, 1866, which applies only to the States of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Florida.

“Treaties with various Indian tribes have been concluded and will be submitted to the Senate for its constitutional action. I cordially sanction the stipulations which provide for reserving lands for the various tribes where they may be encouraged to abandon their nomadic habits and engage in agricultural and industrial pursuits. This policy, inaugurated many years since, has met with signal success whenever it has been pursued in good faith and with becoming liberality by the United States. The necessity for extending it as far as practicable, in our relations with the aboriginal population is greater now than at any preceding period. While we furnish subsistence and instruction to the Indians, and guarantee the undisturbed enjoyment of treaty rights, we should habitually insist upon the faithful observance of their agreement to remain within their respective reservations. This is the only mode by which collisions with other tribes and with the whites can be avoided and the safety of our frontier settlements secured.

“WAR DEPARTMENT AFFAIRS.

“The report of the Secretary of War contains information of interest and importance respecting the several Bureaux of the War Department and the operations of the army. The strength of our military force on the 30th of September last was 48,000 men, and it is computed that, by the 1st of January next, this number will be decreased to 43,000. It is the opinion of the Secretary of War that, within the next year, a considerable diminution of the infantry force may be made without detriment to the interests of the country, and in view of the great expense attending the military peace establishment, and the absolute necessity of retrenchment wherever it can be applied, it is hoped that Congress will sanction the reduction which his report recommends. While in 1860 16,300 men cost the nation \$16,472,000, the sum of \$65,682,000 is estimated as necessary for the support of the army during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1870. The estimates of the War Department for the last two fiscal years were for 1867 \$33,814,461, and for 1868 \$25,205,669. The actual expenditures during the same periods were respectively \$95,224,415 and 123,246,648. The estimate submitted in December last for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1869, was \$77,124,707; the expenditures for the first quarter, ending the 30th of September last, were \$27,219,117, and the Secretary of the Treasury gives \$66,000,000 as the amount which will probably be required during the remaining three quarters, if there should be no reduction in the army, making its aggregate cost for the year considerably in excess of \$93,000,000. The differ-

ence between the estimates and expenditures for the three fiscal years which have been named is thus shown to be \$175,545,343 for this single branch of the public service.

"THE NAVY.

"The report of the Secretary of the Navy exhibits the operations of that department and of the navy during the year. A considerable reduction of the force has been effected. There are forty-two vessels, carrying 411 guns, in the six squadrons which are established in different parts of the world. Three of these vessels are returning to the United States, and four are used as store-ships, leaving the actual cruising force thirty-five vessels, carrying 356 guns. The total number of vessels in the navy is 206, mounting 1743 guns. Eighty-one vessels of every description are in use, armed with 696 guns. The number of enlisted men in the service, including apprentices, has been reduced to 8500. An increase of navy-yard facilities is recommended as a measure which will, in the event of war, be promotive of economy and security. A more thorough and systematic survey of the North Pacific Ocean is advised in view of our recent acquisitions, our expanding commerce, and the increasing intercourse between the Pacific States and Asia. The naval pension fund, which consists of a moiety of the avails of prizes captured during the war, amounts to \$14,000,000. Exception is taken to the Act of the 23rd of July last, which reduces the interest on the fund loaned to the Government by the Secretary as trustee to 3 per cent., instead of 6 per cent., which was originally stipulated when the investment was made. An amendment of the pension laws is suggested to remedy omissions and defects in existing enactments. The expenditures of the department during the last fiscal year were \$20,120,394, and the estimates for the coming year amount to \$20,993,414.

"FOREIGN RELATIONS.

"No important question has occurred during the last year in our accustomed cordial and friendly intercourse with Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, San Salvador, France, Austria, Belgium, Switzerland, Portugal, the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, Rome, Greece, Turkey, Persia, Egypt, Liberia, Morocco, Tripoli, Tunis, Muscat, Siam, Borneo, and Madagascar.

"Cordial relations have also been maintained with the Argentine and the Oriental Republics. The expressed wish of Congress that our national good offices might be tendered to those republics, and also to Brazil and Paraguay, for bringing to an end the calamitous war which has so long been raging in the valley of the La Plata, has been assiduously complied with and kindly acknowledged by all the belligerents. That important negotiation, however, has thus far been without result. . . .

"The correspondence herewith submitted will be found painfully replete with accounts of the ruin and wretchedness produced by

recent earthquakes of unparalleled severity, in the republics of Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia. The diplomatic agents and naval officers of the United States who were present in those countries at the time of those disasters furnished all the relief in their power to the sufferers, and were promptly rewarded with grateful and touching acknowledgments by the Congress of Peru. An appeal to the charity of our fellow-citizens has been answered by much liberality. In this connexion I submit an appeal which has been made by the Swiss Republic, whose Government and institutions are kindred to our own, in behalf of its inhabitants, who are suffering extreme destitution, produced by recent devastating inundations.

"Our relations with Mexico during the year have been marked by an increasing growth of mutual confidence. The Mexican Government has not yet acted upon the three treaties celebrated here last summer for establishing the rights of naturalized citizens upon a liberal and just basis, for regulating consular powers, and for the adjustment of mutual claims. . . .

"I have been reluctantly obliged to ask explanation and satisfaction for national injuries committed by the President of Hayti. The political and social condition of the republics of Hayti and St. Domingo is very unsatisfactory and painful. The abolition of slavery, which has been carried into effect throughout the Island of St. Domingo and the entire West Indies, except the Spanish Islands of Cuba and Porto Rico, has been followed by a profound popular conviction of the rightfulness of republican institutions and an intense desire to secure them. The attempt, however, to establish republics there encounters many obstacles, most of which may be supposed to result from long-indulged habits of colonial supineness and dependence upon European monarchical Powers. While the United States have on all occasions professed a decided unwillingness that any part of this continent or of its adjacent islands shall be made a theatre for a new establishment of monarchical power, too little has been done by us, on the other hand, to attach the communities by which we are surrounded to our own country, or to lend even a moral support to the efforts they are so resolutely and so constantly making to secure republican institutions for themselves. It is indeed a question of grave consideration whether our recent and present example is not calculated to check the growth and expansion of free principles, and make those communities distrust, if not dread, a government which at will consigns to military domination States that are integral parts of our federal Union, and, while ready to resist any attempts by other nations to extend to this hemisphere the monarchical institutions of Europe, assumes to establish over a large portion of its people a rule more absolute, harsh, and tyrannical than any known to civilized Powers.

"The acquisition of Alaska was made with a view of extending national jurisdiction and republican principles in the American

hemisphere. Believing that a further step could be taken in the same direction, I last year entered into a treaty with the King of Denmark for the purchase of the islands of St. Thomas and St. John on the best terms then attainable, and with the express consent of the people of those islands. This treaty still remains under consideration in the Senate. A new convention has been entered into with Denmark, enlarging the time fixed for final ratification of the original treaty.

"Comprehensive national policy would seem to sanction the acquisition and incorporation into our federal Union of the several adjacent continental and insular communities as speedily as it can be done peacefully, lawfully, and without any violation of national justice, faith, or honour. Foreign possession or control of those communities has hitherto hindered the growth and impaired the influence of the United States. Chronic revolution and anarchy there would be equally injurious. Each one of them, when firmly established as an independent republic, or when incorporated into the United States, would be a new source of strength and power. Conforming my administration to these principles, I have on no occasion lent support or toleration to unlawful expeditions set on foot upon the plea of republican propagandism, or of national extension or aggrandizement. The necessity, however, of repressing such unlawful movements clearly indicates the duty which rests upon us of adapting our legislative action to the new circumstances of a decline of European monarchical power and influence, and the increase of American republican ideas, interests, and sympathies.

"I am aware that upon the question of further extending our possessions it is apprehended by some that our political system cannot successfully be applied to an area more extended than our continent; but the conviction is rapidly gaining ground in the American mind that, with the increased facilities for intercommunication between all portions of the earth, the principles of free government, as embraced in our constitution, if faithfully maintained and carried out, would prove of sufficient strength and breadth to comprehend within their sphere and influence the civilized nations of the world. . . .

"The Emperor of Russia has acceded to the treaty negotiated here in January last for the security of trade marks in the interest of manufacturers and commerce. I have invited his attention to the importance of establishing, now while it seems easy and practicable, a fair and equal regulation of the vast fisheries belonging to the two nations in the waters of the North Pacific Ocean.

"The two treaties between the United States and Italy for the regulation of consular powers and the extradition of criminals, negotiated and ratified here during the last Session of Congress, have been accepted and confirmed by the Italian Government. A liberal Consular Convention which has been negotiated with Belgium will be submitted to the Senate. The very important

treaties which were negotiated between the United States and North Germany and Bavaria for the regulation of the rights of naturalized citizens have been duly ratified and exchanged, and similar treaties have been entered into with the Kingdoms of Belgium and Würtemberg and with the Grand Duchies of Baden and Hesse-Darmstadt. I hope soon to be able to submit equally satisfactory Conventions of the same character, now in the course of negotiation, with the respective Governments of Spain, Italy, and the Ottoman Empire.

“Examination of claims against the United States by the Hudson’s Bay Company and the Puget Sound Agricultural Company, on account of certain possessory rights in the State of Oregon and territory of Washington, alleged by those companies in virtue of provisions of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, of June 15, 1846, has been diligently prosecuted, under the direction of the joint International Commission to which they were submitted for adjudication by treaty between the two Governments of July 1, 1863, and will, it is expected, be concluded at an early day.

“No practical regulation concerning colonial trade and the fisheries can be accomplished by treaty between the United States and Great Britain until Congress shall have expressed their judgment concerning the principles involved. Three other questions, however, between the United States and Great Britain remain open for adjustment. These are the mutual rights of naturalized citizens, the boundary question, involving the title to the island of San Juan on the Pacific coast, and mutual claims arising since the year 1853 of the citizens and subjects of the two countries for injuries and depredations committed under the authority of their respective Governments. Negotiations upon these subjects are pending, and I am not without hope of being able to lay before the Senate, for its consideration during the present Session, protocols calculated to bring to an end these justly exciting and long-existing controversies.

“We are not advised of the action of the Chinese Government upon the liberal and auspicious treaty which was recently celebrated with its Plenipotentiaries at this capital.

“Spain having recently undergone a revolution marked by extraordinary unanimity and preservation of order, the Provisional Government established at Madrid has been recognized, and the friendly intercourse which has so long happily existed between the two countries remains unchanged.

“AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION RECOMMENDED.

“I renew the recommendation contained in my communication to Congress dated the 18th of July last—a copy of which accompanies this message—that the judgment of the people shall be taken on the propriety of so amending the Federal Constitution that it shall provide :—

“First,—For an election of President and Vice-President by ●

direct vote of the people, instead of through the agency of electors, and making them ineligible for re-election to a second term.

"Second,—For a distinct designation of the person who shall discharge the duties of President in the event of a vacancy in that office by the death, resignation, or removal of both the President and Vice-President.

"Third,—For the election of Senators of the United States directly by the people of the several States, instead of by the Legislatures; and

"Fourth,—For the limitation to a period of years of the terms of Federal Judges.

"Profoundly impressed with the propriety of making these important modifications in the Constitution, I respectfully submit them for the early and mature consideration of Congress. We should as far as possible remove all pretext for violations of the organic law, by remedying such imperfections as time and experience may develope, ever remembering that 'the Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all.'

"CONCLUSION.

"In the performance of a duty imposed upon me by the Constitution, I have thus communicated to Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommended for their consideration such measures as have seemed to me necessary and expedient. If carried into effect, they will hasten the accomplishment of the great and beneficent purposes for which the Constitution was ordained, and which it comprehensively states were 'to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.' In Congress are vested all legislative powers, and upon them devolves the responsibility as well for framing unwise and excessive laws as for neglecting to devise and adopt measures absolutely demanded by the wants of the country. Let us earnestly hope that before the expiration of our respective terms of service, now rapidly drawing to a close, an all-wise Providence will so guide our counsels as to strengthen and preserve the Federal Union, inspire reverence for the Constitution, restore prosperity and happiness to our whole people, and promote 'on earth peace, good-will towards men.'

"ANDREW JOHNSON.

"Washington, Dec. 9, 1868."

Almost immediately after the delivery of the Message the House of Representatives, in consequence of the paragraph relating to the Public Debt, passed, by a majority of 154 votes to 6, a resolution declaring all forms of repudiation of the national indebtedness odious to the American people, whose representatives would not offer to the national creditor a less amount than the Government had contracted to pay.

RETROSPECT

OF

LITERATURE, ART, AND SCIENCE IN 1868.

IN the Retrospect we propose to lay before our readers of the principal points of interest to be found in the Literature, Art, and Science of the last year, we propose arranging each branch under separate heads, so as to keep more vividly before the eye the progress that has been made during 1868 in these, the main instruments of civilization: we shall not attempt to give a catalogue *raisonnée* of all the books published or of all the works performed in furtherance of this object; but shall simply select such matters as seem to us deserving of notice, believing that, by this method, it will be more easy to form a true judgment of the Literary, Artistic, and Scientific character of the year just past, than could be obtained from unclassified lists such as Publishers' Circulars and Sale Catalogues place before us.

Now Literature may be divided—sufficiently for our purpose—into, 1. Works of History strictly so called, including under them Public Records, Reports of Societies, &c.; 2. Biographies of eminent personages deceased; 3. Miscellaneous, comprising Travels, Poetry, Novels (or, as people love to designate such productions, “light literature”), Translations, New Editions of Works, and the like. Works purely scientific in their character and object would seem to be most appropriately arranged under the science to which they refer. To take

1. WORKS CONNECTED WITH OR RELATING TO HISTORY.

Many records of great interest, and having an important bearing on our knowledge of English History, have been published during the last year. Of these we may specify Mr. Brewer's arrangement and catalogue of the “Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, in the reign of Henry VIII., A.D. 1519—1523, preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and elsewhere in England;” the “Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland of the reign of Elizabeth, A.D. 1574—1585, preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office,” by H. C. Hamilton; “The Calendar of the Carew MSS., preserved in the Archbishopial Library at Lambeth, A.D. 1575—1588,” by J. S. Brewer and W. Bullen; the “*Munimenta Academica; or Documents illustrative of Academical Life and Studies at Oxford*,” by the Rev. Henry Anstey, M.A., in 2 vols., 8vo,

some other works of a similar class to which we shall refer presently, and a small collection of very curious books, edited for the Early English Text Society by F. J. Furnivall.

Of these, the first is unquestionably the most important, and the fulness of it is quite extraordinary, as may readily be judged when we state that for the historical illustration of the four years A.D. 1519—1523, Mr. Brewer gives summaries of nearly 4000 documents, with catalogues and indices occupying about 2000 pages, and an introduction besides of 400 pages. The period to which these documents refer was, indeed, one of the gravest importance, both for the events actually performed during it, and for the preparations made in it for the great drama of the later years of Henry's life. Then it was that the monarchs of England and France met on the Field of the Cloth of Gold, to exchange hollow civilities. Then it was that rival candidates bribed to gain the rank and part of Emperor, and that he who bribed most won the prize. Then it was that Wolsey, as Papal Legate, in the zenith of his power, caused the imposition of taxes so heavy as had well nigh driven the people into open rebellion. Then it was that Henry obtained from Leo X. a Bull (still preserved in the British Museum) giving him the title, since maintained by all our English Sovereigns, of "Defender of the Faith," for writing an answer to Luther. Mr. Brewer is too skilful a workman to put forth as true metal any thing which has not the right ring. Hence our readers may be well assured that this bulky volume contains an immense mass of material, all of which has been diligently sifted and sorted by his zeal and intelligence; material which will be invaluable to all future students of this portion of English history, and which would, we suspect, modify considerably some of the too hasty statements or deductions made by Mr. Froude in his generally excellent history. *Inter alia*, we may note that many details are given with respect to the old custom of giving salaries to members of Parliament, a practice which is said to have lasted till the time of Andrew Marvell, who was, traditionally at all events, the last recipient of such payments.

The explanation of this custom is easy when we remember how far greater the labour and cost must have been for the member for Chester or Exeter who had to travel Londonwards from these cities than it would have been either now or during any part of the last one hundred years. Our ancestors thought, we will not say unwisely, that if they taxed a man's time so seriously, they ought at least to make good actual pecuniary loss. These payments were first made in the reign of Edward I., and in the reign of Edward IV. city members received 2s. and county members received 4s., no inconsiderable sum when we remember that a shilling, temp. Edward IV., was worth from 18s. to 20s. of our present money.

The Calendars, edited respectively by Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Brewer, are of much interest to those historical students who care to know what was the real state of Ireland during the period to which they respectively refer. Thus we find the head of the O'Neils exerted himself as energetically against England for the aid of the Spanish Armada as could any of his descendants for the Repeal of the Union or the destruction of the English Church in Ireland; this chieftain at the same time expressly declaring that his real object was to become himself King of Ireland, if only for an hour. In a pedigree which is given of his race it is quaintly remarked that "the names of Shane O'Neil's sons are Henry Con Shane, Hugh, Art, Turlough, and Brien, *two of whom were by his wife!*" The chief difficulty an English reader experiences in the examination of these, and of

most other documents of early Irish history, is to find out, with any sense of satisfaction, on which side the truth really lies. The desire of each party to put the best possible face on all done by his own side, often renders it all but impossible to strike a fair balance between the severe line of truth and the ever-varying kaleidoscope created by the mind of poetic and imaginative Irishmen.

Another of the valuable documents we owe to the energy of the present Master of the Rolls—the account of mediæval University life at Oxford, entitled “*Munimenta Academica*, Parts I. and II.: Documents illustrative of Life and Studies at Oxford”—has been edited with great care and judgment by the Rev. H. Anstey, M.A. This work consists of the publication of various MSS. hitherto but partially known, and never before brought together, of which the first is known by the title of the “Chancellor’s Book,” the date of which is probably not later than A.D. 1530. This book contains the patent letters of various sovereigns, with charters, Papal Bulls, the assize of measures, the price of wheat, &c. Though much injured, as the editor thinks, about the time of Archbishop Laud, when the whole Statute Book was revised, much still remains, and is of the highest interest. The next MS. is called “The Southern Proctor’s Book,” the date of which is known to be A.D. 1477, as the cost of its production is preserved in the accounts of the University for that year. A third is the “Junior or Northern Proctor’s Book,” which was written by the order of Richard Fleming, afterward Bishop of Lincoln, during his Proctorship in A.D. 1407. Besides these, are the Acts of the Chancellor’s Court from A.D. 1434 to A.D. 1469—with the exception of the years 1440 and 1441; a book called Farley’s Register, the chief interest of which consists in its containing a large number of miscellaneous letters written to and from the University in the fifteenth century, together with two catalogues of the books given to the University by Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. It is not a little remarkable, that of the 300 volumes, mentioned in these lists with sufficient minuteness for their present recognition if in existence, it is all but certain, that one only now exists in the Bodleian Library which can with any show of reason be held to be one of the volumes from the library of the famous Duke of Gloucester. There can be little doubt that the gift of these books was one of the most valuable donations the University received during its earlier days, and we may well wonder at the singular want of care which can have allowed of its nearly complete loss.

It is difficult to overrate the value of this series of the early annals and mediæval life of the University of Oxford, which may be traced by them to the very first period when it became in any real sense an University. Many curious matters are related in them, and last, not least, the establishment and practical working of an institution almost identical with modern pawn-broking, moreover, established and recognized by the chief authorities of the University, and used for the benefit chiefly of the poorer scholars. The institution of what were called “*chests*” seems to have been the earliest form of corporate property possessed by the University, and was, it would appear, created by Robert Grossteste, the famous Bishop of Lincoln. The preamble of the ordinance for founding a “*chest*” set forth the name of the founder, the sum given, and the object for which it was given, which was always eleemosynary. From these “*chests*” every scholar had the privilege of borrowing, a pledge for the full amount of or above the value borrowed being in each case deposited by the borrower. The University stationer attended at fixed hours to appraise the value of each pledge, and two guardians, usually a north and a south countryman, were appointed to ensure a

fair judgment of the claims of the applicants. *The MSS. mention many of the valuable pledges thus left by students, as, for instance, volumes beautifully illuminated, daggers of more than ordinary workmanship, silver cups, hoods lined with minever, &c.

Of some of the most curious and amusing facts scattered broad-cast through these interesting volumes, we may notice the following. Thus we find the wise and just regulation that no one shall be sued during his absence or during vacation; that causes must be decided in three days; the excommunication of the Mayor of the city by the Chancellor for removing the pillory; an ordinance that if the Chancellor be absent more than a month during full term, his office shall become, *ipso facto* vacant. We find that masses were ordered to be said for the soul of Edward III., as for other distinguished personages; a statute to compel tailors to cut robes of the proper dimensions; and that no scholar expelled from one hall be received into another till he has been punished and has provided sureties for good conduct. No heads of colleges or halls are to admit any scholar or servant suspected of being a Lollard; and an order is given that all persons engaged in writing or engrossing legal deeds shall attend lectures on rhetoric and grammar, there being no lectures in the French language for them to attend.

Mr. Bergenroth, who has been employed for some time under the direction of the Master of the Rolls in the examination of the MSS. relating to England and Spain, among the archives at Simancas in Spain, has produced a very valuable collection of documents on various negotiations between Spain and England, at a period of history of much interest to both countries. In two volumes of Calendar and one of Supplement he gives the memorials of forty years from the battle of Bosworth Field to the date of Katharine's quarrel with Wolsey. The reader will therein find an abundance of new matter, and will learn for the first time not the least curious fact of the whole story, viz. that when Mr. Bergenroth began to work many documents were withheld from him, and that when at last he wrung them from the reluctant hands of the authorities, he was compelled to print a supplement, which upsets many of the views maintained in his two first volumes.

Mr. Furnivall's editions for the English Text Society comprise several works which throw much insight into the domestic history of the Middle Ages, written, as most of them were, for the education of young children, and for the giving them those "manners" which William of Wykeham rightly thought "makyth man." One especial volume termed "French and Latin Poems on like Subjects, and some Forewords on Education in early England," is full of these curious moral "saws and wise sayings." Thus we learn that children are always to come to their meals with clean hands, and not to leave the refectory till they had dipped their greasy fingers in clean water; gentlemen are requested not to wipe their noses on the cloth, and courtesy is described as coming from Heaven, when Gabriel greeted "our Lady." Extreme cleanliness and constant prayer are enjoined as of absolute necessity; and if children forgot this or any one of the hundreds of regulations recorded in these books, the rod was ready "to reform this negligence." Nor was this minute care bestowed on the boys only. The girls were to be obedient to God, pure of heart, zealous Church-goers, whom rain could not deter, and as lovely as they could make themselves, if they cared to become, what it was supposed they all aspired to be—not angels—but wives. Wives were not to envy other ladies who chanced to have handsomer dresses than their own. Moreover, they were not to get drunk. The modes of discipline seem to us to be as various as the

occasions which called for their exercise. Thus one writer, Hugh Rhodes, tells us, "If any strife or debate be among them of thy house, at night, charitably call them together, and with words or stripes make them all agree in one." It is certain Mr. Rhodes did not anticipate that his advice would have been (no doubt unwittingly followed) by a recent Head Master of Eton of flogging memory, who once, unknown to the rest of the school, indeed to any but those flogged, whipped the whole Fifth Form, during the early hours of the night, the result being, that when daybreak came, some 120 or more young rebels awoke to the fact that they were sorer and wiser than they had been twelve hours before.

Some curious incidental matters we learn from these early documents. Thus the meat cooked in the kitchen was closely watched till it reached the "High Table." Squires, we learn, guarded it from thieves, other officials taking no less care that it was not purloined by the squires. After dinner, young men were expected to study, but if reading should chance to make a man sleepy, he is recommended to sleep standing, "leaning against a cupboard." Nay, further, if a man wished to have light slumbers, he is strictly bidden to sleep on his right side; and, in the morning, he is further told to jump up at once, to pray to God, and to brush his breeches inside and out. Combing the head well required drawing the comb through at least forty times; and if the dandy of the day chose to wear a precious stone, this was to be considered not so much a decoration as a charm against diseases and other evils. Further, if they were called on to do homage, kneeling on both knees to a man (who has only a right to the bending of one) is said to be paying a tribute due to God alone. Lastly, travellers were ordered under no pretence to put up at an inn kept by a red-haired man or woman. We may remark that this sensitiveness to the colour of hair seems to be something like an instinct among the more savage and uninstructed races; and that to this we owe the historical difference between the *Fin-gal* or *Fair Gael*, and Roderick *Dhu*, or "the dark," a distinction which, curiously enough, has led to blunders innumerable with regard to the early populations of Ireland. The "Phenicians" of the Irish writers of the last century, the "Fenians," whose ravages we have had to deplore so recently, both really are modifications or corruptions of the Celtic word for the "fair" people. Neither has aught to do with the historical *Phenicians*.

We cannot close this portion of our subject, the early records which are the bony structure of later history, without calling attention to a very curious discovery made by Mr. Hepworth Dixon, the well-known editor of the "Athenæum." We give it in the exact words of the official report of Mr. Thomas Duffus Hardy, the Assistant Keeper of the Public Records, as we consider the whole transaction reflects great credit on the *acumen* and good sense, let us add, also, on the patriotic spirit of Mr. Dixon. Mr. Hardy says, "During a tour in America in 1866, Mr. W. Hepworth Dixon visited the Library Company of Philadelphia, and saw five volumes of Irish State Papers, which had been presented to that company in 1799. Mr. Dixon suggested to the librarian that it would be a graceful act on the part of the authorities of the library to restore to the British government the volumes in question, as they were evidently a part of the national archives of Great Britain, and had been removed without permission by some person from Dublin. The directors of the Library Company immediately and unanimously agreed in the propriety of the suggestion, and a communication was accordingly made to the Master of the Rolls through the medium of Mr. Dixon. His lordship immediately informed the Lords Commissioners of your Majesty's Treasury of

Mr. Dixon's intimation, forwarding, at the same time, a letter on the subject from Mr. Lloyd P. Smith, the librarian of the Library Company of Philadelphia. He proposed that a suitable acknowledgment should be made by the Lords of the Treasury to the Library Company, and that the letter be accompanied with a copy of all the Government works published by their authority under his direction, in testimony of their high appreciation of a gift so honourably and so disinterestedly made by the directors of the library to the British nation. The Lords of the Treasury, by their minute of the 18th of January, 1867, having accepted the offer made by the Library Company of Philadelphia, the five volumes were forwarded to England by your Majesty's Minister at Washington, and duly received by the Master of the Rolls the 24th of April, 1867. His lordship immediately informed the Treasury of the safe arrival of these MSS., and suggested that it would be a graceful act if their lordships would direct him to deliver the five volumes to the care of the Public Record Office in Dublin, as they related more especially to the history of Ireland, and ought to be preserved in the archives there. He further urged that, by such a procedure, their lordships would follow the liberal example set by the Philadelphia Library Company in making restitution of these volumes to the country to which they properly belonged. In the persuasion that their lordships would comply with the suggestion, the Master of the Rolls gave orders to have four of the volumes copied *verbatim et literatim*, the copies to be properly authenticated, and placed for general use in the search room of the Public Record Office in London. It was not deemed necessary to have the fifth volume transcribed (the Memoirs of the Marquis of Clanricarde), as it had been already printed. The Lords of the Treasury approved the recommendation of the Master of the Rolls, that the volumes should be strongly bound, and that a suitable inscription should be placed upon them, commemorative of the circumstances under which they were restored to the British nation, and they directed that the volumes should be delivered to the care of the Public Record Office in Dublin, in order that they might be preserved in the archives of the country to the history of which they more especially relate. The volumes will accordingly be transmitted to Dublin, when the transcript is completed. In conformity also with the recommendations of the Master of the Rolls, a set, as far as published, of the Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland, numbering 156 volumes, and of the Calendars of State Papers, as well as of the facsimiles in Photozincography of Domesday Book, and of the national MSS., uniformly bound, was sent to the Philadelphia Library Company, as a grateful acknowledgment of the feelings their lordships entertained of the honourable and disinterested spirit which prompted their gift. The directors of the library have returned thanks, through the Master of the Rolls, to your Majesty's Government for this 'munificent gift.' It is but justice to Mr. Hepworth Dixon to state that it is entirely owing to his zealous activity that these valuable muniments have been restored to the British nation."

We only wish that a few more men so well acquainted with the early history of England as Mr. Dixon is known to be, could be induced to spend a longer time than they do at present in the examination of English records widely dispersed in foreign countries. What Simancas has preserved for us, the readers of Froude's history well know, but Spain has only, by accident, preserved what we have reason to believe exists in far greater abundance elsewhere. Shall the Vatican never be compelled to give up its hidden treasures? Once we had a hope on this subject, when an Englishman, Cardinal Wiseman, was named as

librarian ; but we have his own, the highest assurance on this matter, that fears were entertained that if so appointed, his northern spirit would have led him to inquire into the contents of the Vatican vaults too searchingly to be altogether convenient. So his appointment was not confirmed.

2. BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES.

The Life of Prince Henry of Portugal, surnamed the Navigator, by Mr. R. H. Major, is at once one of the most creditable and most carefully elaborated Biographies we have had the pleasure of examining. Moreover, it has been drawn up by the very man who, in England, perhaps we should say any where, was best fitted to perform the task ; being, as he happens to be, himself keeper of the maps and charts in the British Museum, and one of the honorary secretaries of the Geographical Society. Well did the Prince deserve the title of the Navigator. Born in March, 1394, his first deed of prowess was to assist his brother in expelling the Moors from Ceuta, which they have never since been able to recover. His next, to plan, and in part to carry out, the great scheme of the conquest of Guinea, which, however, he did not for some years accomplish, as the ships he sent out yearly were not able to get round Cape Boyador. The Portuguese, indeed, in those days, as Barros observes, were not accustomed to venture into the open sea, their nautical knowledge being limited to coasting along in sight of land. The examination, however, of the African coast was by no means the whole object of Prince Henry's early ambition. His great desire was to discover the nearest track to India, to find out an ocean way to that land of wealth and wonders, and to secure for his own country the trade thus brought, as of old, at great cost and labour overland by caravans. With this view, he took up his abode about 1418 at Sagres in Algarve, a most inhospitable place, at the S.W. angle of Europe, with nothing but "a few stunted juniper-trees to relieve the sadness of the shifting sand." His first reward was the rediscovery by Gonsalvez Zarco and Tristram Vaz of the islands of Porto Santo and Madeira. Traditionally, at all events, perhaps truly, Madeira was discovered first in the reign of Edward III., by Robert Machim, an Englishman, whose name is supposed to be preserved in that of the first village and harbour (Machico) one meets with on arriving from England. There is no doubt that the two islands were known to exist as early as 1351, as they appear on the "Portulano Medices" preserved in the library at Florence, which bears that date. They were colonized at once by Prince Henry ; the sugar cane was planted in Madeira, and the *Malvasia* or *Malvoisie* grape was imported from Cyprus. In 1433 Gil Eannes succeeded in rounding Cape Boyador, and, two years later, the same distinguished sailor, accompanied by Baldaya, sailed fifty leagues beyond Boyador and found traces of men and camels, but no habitations. Baldaya, in a third expedition, sailed seventy leagues still further South, landed at the Rio de Ouro, and brought back news of the natives. Many expeditions followed, and place after place on the Senegambia coast were discovered. In 1465 Prince Henry engaged the services of a famous Venetian navigator Cadamosto, who continued the exploration of the African coast, and discovered the Gambia, before Prince Henry's death in 1460. Mr. Major, having completed what may be called the actual biography of Prince Henry, gives some excellent chapters on the general result of the Prince's labours and of the spirit he had infused into his countrymen, and which led them for years to be the great pioneers of geographical research. "The Coast of Africa," says he, "visited ; the Cape of Good Hope rounded ; the

new world disclosed; the sea-way to India, the Moluccas and China laid open; the globe circumnavigated, and Australia discovered; such were the stupendous results of great thought and indomitable perseverance, in spite of twelve years of costly failure and disheartening ridicule." The fact about the discovery of Australia by the Portuguese, after it had been stated for years that the Dutch in 1605 were the first to discover it, may probably be new to many of our readers; but we are constrained to agree with Mr. Major, who, after a very careful examination of all the evidence, says that it is "highly probable that Australia was discovered by the Portuguese between the years 1511 and 1529, and to a demonstrable certainty that it was discovered before the year 1542." The finding of the passage round the Cape, which had been the dream of Prince Henry's life, was, as is well known, ultimately accomplished by Bartholomew Diaz in 1487, twenty-seven years after his death.

Those readers who are still interested in the Old War will find much to interest them in a short life recently published by his kinsman, Mr. John Murray Graham, of General Lord Lynedoch, who had Macpherson, the editor of "*Ossian*," for his tutor, who did not enter the army till 1793, when he was already forty-five years of age, and who lived for several months into his ninety-sixth year. Lord Lynedoch's first service was with Lord Hood in the South of France, assisting the Royalists at Toulon, and from this time he remained in active service till 1814, when his gallant but unsuccessful attempt on Bergen-op-Zoom ended a military career which had justly won for him the credit of being one of Wellington's most distinguished officers. At the end of the war Lord Lynedoch retired from the army and devoted himself with characteristic energy to the pursuit of sport, to the diversions of society, and to the amusement of foreign travel. His biographer states that "his personal activity and love of locomotion continued during the whole of his life. When residing at Cosgrove Priory, he would, after a late London dinner party, be at the meet of the hounds in Northamptonshire, at half-past ten the following morning." Lord Lynedoch's wife, who died so long ago as 1792, and whose death, it is said, drove him to seek consolation in the army, was the original of the "Mrs. Graham," the celebrated picture of Gainsborough, which was one of the wonders of the Manchester Exhibition of 1857. It is said, that, on her early death, the old general was so distressed that he had this picture nailed up in a box, and that it was only discovered again a short time before the Exhibition. Be this as it may, it certainly had an appearance confirmatory of this story, for it looked as fresh as if it had been painted but the year before.

The Memoirs of Baron Bunsen, which have been most carefully edited by his widow, and his own great work, "*God in History; or, The Progress of Man's Faith in a Moral Order of the World*," cannot be treated separately, so fully do they throw light on each other, so completely, at least, does the latter derive its main inspiration and power from the hourly and daily training which made Bunsen what he was. It must not, however, be supposed that the present volumes will give to those who had not the happiness of knowing him any adequate idea of Bunsen himself. These pages are only what they profess to be, the private and personal records of this great and good man, arranged and drawn up in homely language, in ignorance of mere literary style, yet, for this reason, the more genuine and true; documents indeed such as would naturally be made use of by a kind and affectionate woman who was his constant helpmate, whose character and judgment, we know, often had much influence with him (invariably for his good), and who still survives to relate what he was to her and to her

family. Those who care for Bunsen as a politician must consult his voluminous literary works, his private correspondence with King Frederic William IV., and his official correspondence with the Prussian Government. They will there find what is indeed no where more conspicuously shown than in these volumes, that with the largest heart and the widest appreciation of all that was good in lands foreign to that "which first cradled his birth," Bunsen, to his dying day, was pre-eminently and intensely German. Never did he swerve from the high purpose he had marked out for himself, the promotion of the union of the German nation, and the consolidation, by free institutions, of the future power of Germany. It was, indeed, this peculiar bent of his genius which alone, occasionally though rarely, made Bunsen unpopular in England. The plain, unspeculative Englishman could not or would not understand the refined intellect of the German ambassador. We looked on him but too often as a professor, a name still to English ears too much resembling that of pedagogue. And yet, after all—remembering him as so many of us still remember him, and the happy privileged hours we passed in his society—it seems impossible that we could doubt what like the man himself must have been.

The child, the intellectual heir, of Niebuhr, the bosom friend of Arnold, Hare, Herschel, Maurice, Schnorr, Mendelssohn, Max Muller, the late King of Prussia, and Prince Albert, the loving friend, the ready help of many other and younger students, of whom Rheinhold Pauli shall serve as our type, it could not be but that such a man, cosmopolitan in the widest sense of the word, for Prussia, the home of his heart, was probably the country of which he saw the least during forty years; diplomatist in the truest sense, for they who knew and loved him knew, too, how closely he identified himself with the material interests as well as with the society of every state to which he for the time chanced to be accredited; and last, not least, a firmly-rooted Protestant, not with the ignorant fervour of an Orangeman, but with the firm, conscientious belief in the undying truth that freedom (as Selden phrased it, *περὶ πάντος ἐλευθερία*, *before all things freedom*) was the first heritage of the nations, who, like England and Prussia, have hitherto adhered to the blessed principles of the Reformation;—how could we doubt that such a man with some few enemies (we believe he had not one in England), with some doubters and possibly more cavillers, should have exercised, as he undoubtedly did exercise, a prodigious sway over the intellects of the younger and the rising men of their day in England; nor can we, at this distance of time, assert that this intellectual sway was unfair or undeserved. Grant that one of the chief hobbies of Bunsen, or perhaps we ought rather to say of his master, the King of Prussia, namely the establishment of an Episcopate at Jerusalem, did fail chiefly because, as we believe, neither the time nor the people were ripe for it; grant, if you will, that, throwing himself as he did with passionate ardour into every subject which for the time interested his mind, his confidence was easily won, his generous nature readily enthralled, and his intelligence sometimes captivated by a mere idea;—yet what, after all, does this amount to? To nothing surely more than this, that Bunsen retained to the last the freshness and vivacity of his younger days, with a charm almost peculiarly his own; that the failure of hopes long cherished, and disappointments which others would have long felt, perhaps rejoiced to brood over, were to him little more than a passing shadow on a day of the brightest sunshine. Nothing seemed to disturb the serenity of his feelings and of his temper. Old Jan-koffsky, who had known him better and longer than most men during his

famous sojourn of twenty-one years at Rome, spoke of him with but scant appreciation when he said, "I never knew such another child of fifty." We have not space here to review the smaller circumstances of Bunsen's life, yet it may be well to note that, in his earlier years, he owed his chief advancement to the friendship with Englishmen or Americans, and that to Mr. Astor, the son of the famous American merchant, and to Mr. Cathcart, an English gentleman who read with him at Florence, is due the great advantage that he was able to establish himself at Rome, and there to fall in love with Miss Waddington, a young English lady of good family and fortune.

Perhaps there have been few men at any time who have worked harder than Bunsen, yet it is remarkable that the books he has left behind him are comparatively few in number. During his long residence in Rome the only important book he gave to the public was his well-known "Description" of that city. His "Church of the Future," his "Hippolytus," his "Signs of the Times," and the four volumes of his great work on Egypt were composed while Prussian ambassador in England. His last great work, "God in History," which has been admirably translated into English by Miss Winkworth, and his vast commentary and revision of the Holy Scriptures were almost wholly written either at his beautiful residence on the Neckar, or during his last years at Bonn. Possessed of the highest and the deepest sense of religion, it is curious that Bunsen's researches often lead him to the very verge of Rationalism; just as having commenced in early life as a zealous Conservative, the last words he uttered were to invoke a blessing on Garibaldi. His mind was so constructed as to be incapable of being subjected to law or dogma, and he seems often to have taken his own course without clearly perceiving whither it was leading him. Hence as a guide no man could have been less safe; he deserves, however, to be remembered as an able and conscientious thinker, the founder, we believe, too, in no small degree, of the tone and character of one phase of the present religious thought in this country. We venture to think that, but for the active presence of such a genius as Bunsen, the revivers of mediæval customs and thoughts at Oxford would not have met with the rude rebuff they did experience. Certain it is, that he was among the first to note their tendency and to sound an alarm which Protestant England has never since failed to echo.

We are not surprised that Mr. Percy Fitzgerald's "Life of Garrick" should add but little to the just fame and reputation in which the greatest of English actors has been held during at least a century; for we remembered that, within the last two or three years, Mr. Fitzgerald had poured forth lives of Charles Lamb and Sterne; either of which, to be fully elaborated, ought to have had this whole time to itself. Still less did we expect that a man who had shown himself so careless and inaccurate in his former volumes would have shown much real improvement in this his third production. Both these anticipations have been fully realized. For the new matter he has added, including, as this does, a large number of letters, &c., which Garrick himself had preserved and docketed, and a correspondence which, if carefully arranged and dovetailed together, would have proved the most precious basis for a complete life, Mr. Fitzgerald is simply indebted to Mr. John Forster, into whose hands these documents came many years since; and pity indeed it is that Mr. Forster did not himself accomplish—as he would have accomplished thoroughly—the work which has been so feebly attempted in the volumes before us. Secondly, we are sorry to state that, with any amount of carelessness in the names he

quotes, or in the persons he speaks of, and with an obvious—perhaps wise abhorrence of references—the hooks and eyes, so to speak, of all good biography no less than of all satisfactory history, whereby we might, did we choose to do so, verify some of his most questionable statements, Mr. Fitzgerald combines the less doubtful qualification, to wit, an ignorance of the language in which he writes; though, we presume, his native tongue. Mr. Fitzgerald, in plain words, cannot write English; nor, if by chance he be an Irishman, is his case amended: we have not quite forgotten how an Irish Swift, or Goldsmith, or Burke, or Grattan, or Sheridan did write and speak; or how in this, the most modern period, the worthy successor of Faraday, John Tyndall, expresses his glowing thoughts like on paper or by voice.

The following casually selected sentences will be enough, we think, to satisfy any reader of Mr. Fitzgerald's qualifications as a writer of English. Speaking of the "Garrick pamphlets," he says,—“A complete collection of these Garrick pamphlets would be curious. The British Museum is a very imperfect gathering, but *whose* number is still very considerable.” Again: “There *was* always crowded houses.” Again: “Carrying the precious *wares* in their pockets, that *was* to make all their fortunes.” Lastly, one special sentence we quote, not only for its inferred and ungrammatical English, but for its curious inversion. Speaking of one of the chief talkers at the Bedford Coffee House, he remarks,—“Here, too, *was seen* that wild, and witty, and drunken Dr. Harrowby, who, after a jovial life, *had died* the death that so often attends on a jovial life;” and, further: “The pupil *whom* he fancied *was* fast asleep below.” On the general subject of the life of Garrick we cannot but feel that poor Garrick has been sorely—not to say sorrowfully—treated by his biographers. Murphy, Davies, Boaden, each in their own way have tried their hands at this task; the two former as members of his own company, and therefore, as it would seem, deeply prejudiced against him, the third a dull, heavy, sensible man, whose life is colourless and inaccurate, but so far pleasant that it is not needlessly venomous. No doubt the difficulties of writing a life of Garrick have largely increased, owing to the entire change, not only of manners, but of habits of thought, during the last eighty years. It is comparatively easy to throw oneself back into the time of the Stuarts, and to conjure up an image of Charles I., or even of his degenerate descendants, Charles II. or James II.; but who now can adequately render for us the stately comeliness of the Johnsonian meetings at Tunbridge Wells, or the wild revelry of the Ranelagh, of Vauxhall, or of the Westminster Cockpit?

Mr. Charles Duke Yonge has supplied us with a very useful and readable book in the “Life of Robert Banks Jenkinson, Earl of Liverpool,” a life which, if even tolerably well done, could not fail to have much interest for any student of modern history when we consider the remarkable period of time in which he was a prominent actor, having been for ten years Secretary of State, and no less than fifteen Prime Minister during the most critical time of England's—indeed of Europe's—modern history. Born in 1770, and sent at an early age to the Charter House, and thence to Christ Church, Oxford, when he was scarcely more than sixteen years old, he lived for some time the life of a studious and secluded student, making but few friends; yet, among these, two who continued his intimate friends through life, Lord Gower Leveson and George Canning. After leaving Oxford he travelled for some time on the Continent, witnessing the outbreak of the French Revolution, and being actually present at the siege of the Bastille. On his return to England, when still not twenty-one,

he was elected M.P. for the borough of Appleby, and made his maiden speech in 1791, in reply to Mr. Whitbread, who had attacked the Government on the question of the Russian Armament. Mr. Pitt, in complimenting Mr. Jenkinson on this speech, declared in the House that "it would have done credit to the most practised debater and the most experienced statesman that ever existed." In 1792 Mr. Pitt offered him a seat at the India Board; and, from that date to his death, he was, with one short exception, in constant employment. His first important occupation was the framing of the famous Peace of Amiens with the French Consul, when, in 1801, Pitt retired, and Addington, afterwards Lord Sidmouth, became Prime Minister. At this time he showed the germs of those liberal opinions to which he adhered to the last, having agreed with Pitt in the justice to the Roman Catholics of what was called "Catholic Emancipation," though neither of them was able to prevail over the strong prejudices of the King and his fear for his Coronation Oath.

Four years later Mr. Jenkinson, now Lord Liverpool, performed the important service to the country of reconciling Pitt and Addington, who, though not enemies, had been since the Peace on unfriendly terms; still later, he was ready to serve as Home Secretary under that effete old man, the Duke of Portland, who had been selected as temporary head of the Tory party. During the long troubles at home caused by the high prices and European war, Lord Liverpool maintained the dignity of his office, being apparently the only one who, from the first, never shrunk from his belief in the Duke of Wellington. We all know how bitterly the Duke wrote from the Peninsula, and how severely he animadverted on the feebleness and hesitation of the then Home Government, when every nerve ought to have been strained to afford him as much national aid as was possible; but few, if any, of these angry letters were addressed to Lord Liverpool; or, at all events, without some apology, showing that the Duke was well aware and ready to admit that Lord Liverpool was not himself to blame for not having greater influence over his colleagues. In 1809 Mr. Perceval became Prime Minister; and, after his assassination in 1812, Lord Liverpool succeeded to this, the highest office of the English Government, and retained it till his death in 1827. During this long period, though there was as yet a want of that freedom—not to say licence—which prevails now among almost all classes, much was in progress for the release of religion and trade from bonds which for ages had been thought necessary for their security. In this movement Lord Liverpool was an honest and high-minded agent. Thus, in 1814, he brought in a Bill permitting the free exportation of corn, supporting his plan by arguments founded on the fact that Free Trade was right in principle, though it was no less evident that the time had not yet come when it was possible to carry that full measure, with which Mr. Cobden's name has been so justly associated. It is assuredly remarkable that one whom his opponents are never weary of calling a "mere Tory Minister" should so early have called Free Trade "the one sound system of legislation on such matters which ought never to be departed from, except on some special ground demanding particular exceptions." The following years were those of riot, disturbance, and misery in England; caused, no doubt, in no small degree by the collapse of trade, on the cessation of the twenty-five years' war of the French Revolution. During this period, as we gather from Lord Liverpool's letters and speeches, though strenuously in favour of law and order, he was averse, by the gentle constitution of his mind, from carrying out the extreme penalties of the law, except in cases of the gravest importance.

entire mistake to suppose that, antecedently to the Reformation, Convocation could pass a single canon without the King's consent, still less that a Bull or an Ecclesiastical Constitution could be published in any part of this realm without the King's express concurrence. Bishopricks were in those times filled up by the Crown, as gifts, before it granted to the several chapters the modified right conferred by the *Congé d'Élire*. Even under the *Congé d'Élire* we know that the King constantly made his selection directly, as in the memorable case of Bishop Tunstall. Men seem to forget the troubles which embittered the relations between Rome and this country during centuries preceding the Reformation; and, more than this, that, though the Pope never failed in his efforts to obtain the recognition of his claim to be the fountain-head of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, this claim was never admitted, but, by God's grace, always in the long run successfully resisted. The Dean well points out that the only time in history when there was any real fear of failure of these great principles was during a short period after the Reformation had become an admitted fact; for, says he, we must admit that "the distinction between the royal and the sacerdotal powers was totally disregarded by Thomas Cromwell and the unprincipled men who formed the Government of Edward VI." . . . and that "much injury was done to the cause of the Church through the mistaken policy of our leading ecclesiastics under the unfortunate dynasty of the Stuarts. To strengthen their position against the Romish Nonconformists on the one hand, and the Puritan Nonconformists on the other, they exaggerated the Royal prerogative."

3. MISCELLANEA.

Among the more interesting works on general literature issued during the year 1868, we cannot omit noticing "Leaves from the Journal of our Life in the Highlands, from 1848 to 1861, &c., &c.," by Her Majesty the Queen—a work which it is not too much to say could only have been published by an English Queen, and addressed to an English audience. In this remarkable book the Queen has spoken, and not in vain, to the domestic sympathies of her people. Its claim to the universal notice and appreciation it must surely obtain, being the genuine simplicity with which the story of the private life of the Royal family is told. We learn from it, what those who have been admitted within that charmed circle have ever told us was the case, that the first lady in this land loves, whenever she can withdraw herself from the serious duties of her position, to pursue the simple tastes and amusements of a woman's life. Thus we find her watching the progress of her children as they grow up from day to day, showing herself familiar with all the details of the lives of even her servants, sharing with intense pleasure the pursuits, the sports, the tastes of her husband, and recording from day to day these jottings in her journal, never with the view of their reaching any eye but her own, and, even now, only permitting them to appear in the garish light of day, that the world may learn from her unadorned and contemporaneous narrative, how great the loss she and England have suffered by the death of so able and so good a man as Prince Albert. As was well remarked shortly after the volume appeared, its lightness and elegance proved an universal passport. Laying no claim to the dignity of history or the gravity of literature, its merits are precisely those which graver historians and more practised writers often fail to attain. To say simple and common things well is not an easy task, still less to say them in such a way that they may im-

press the memory and touch the heart. Contrast the lives of Louis XIV. or of George IV. with that of Prince Albert and his Queen. The lives of those men were in their day deemed the highest types of refinement and majesty, yet, infected with the vulgarity of vice, they lived a purely artificial life, the coarseness and meanness of their nature being ever ready to show itself through the tinsel of their outward glory. But the Highland life of Prince Albert's court was but the simple life of any house in the Highlands. It would be difficult to design a more pleasing accurate picture of life and character in any one of them than the Queen has given us from Balmoral. Mr. Helps, the wise editor of this excellent book, justly remarks, in his unassuming preface, that the notes the Queen has thought fit to affix to the names of her personal attendants with the object of describing their relation to herself, and even their past history in her service, illustrate in a striking manner the patriarchal feeling (if one may apply such a word as 'patriarchal' to a lady) which is so strong in the present occupant of the throne." We conceive the appearance of, and the reception that it has met with from the public at large, and, as we have reason to know, its appreciation by the poorer classes, for whose benefit the Queen has, with her usual consideration, permitted a cheap reprint, is a manifest proof that the rubbish of ecstatic novels and of sensational dramas has not yet sapped the sound foundations of English feeling and morality.

The School Inquiry Commission has published during the last year some very important papers, and among them "A Report of the System of Education for the Middle and Upper Classes in France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland," by M. Arnold, Esq., the collected materials of which will be interesting to those who have leisure to wade through the *pièces justificatives*, which form by far the most important part of his volume. The work, however, to our notions, is much marred by the spirit in which it is written, and by the strange ignorance which meets us every where as to the changes which have been made in English Education during the last twenty years. Thus, in cases where Mr. Arnold has to compare French teaching with English teaching, he has, apparently, no alternative but to fall back on what he may chance to recollect of the *stories* of Winchester or Rugby when he was himself a boy. He evidently does not, as a rule, know where to look for flaws in any given system; hence, he too often takes the official programme as the representative of something like perfection. Nor does he appear to have made much preparation for the seven months spent abroad at the expense of the country. He is always, during these travels, in a restless state of astonishment, and his report, therefore, too often reminds the reader of a traveller's tale of an unexplored country. Last of all, there are, during these supposed researches, but slight traces of his own personal experience; his visits are often timed just when the schools are shut for vacation, while, we cannot help thinking, that a report so meagre might with ease have been drawn up by any clear-headed dealer in statistics from the various French and other official programmes without sending Mr. Arnold away on this Continental tour of inspection. Another thing we must be allowed to enter our protest against, and that is, the constant abuse with which Mr. Arnold speaks of every thing English. It is one thing to adopt the supposed national habit of thinking every thing done by other than Englishmen bad, or weak, or useless; another to run down every thing English, and to cry up every thing foreign. Mr. Arnold's Report is one continued grumble from the first page to the last; every thing foreign is good, every thing English is bad. One foreign school he imagines

just like another; if he has not seen the Polytechnicum at Zürich, he has at least seen the Polytechnicum at Stuttgart, and these are all very good. In poor benighted England the schools are bad, the masters bad, the boys badly prepared—too much crammed—probably, too, examined at a wrong age; even their games (hear this, ye cricketers of Eton and Harrow!), are not so good as the foreign gymnastics! Lastly, the nation is wholly past redemption, because so few members of it have read—still less thoroughly digested—Mr. Arnold's "Report on Primary Education," though it has been before the world so long a period as seven years! Mr. Arnold's report on France is the fullest, and was, at the same time, the first accomplished; it, therefore, bears the strongest marks of his idiosyncrasies.

The *École Normale*, of which he gives an interesting account, is his *cheval de bataille* against English schools and English systems. No doubt it is a grand thing to educate yearly 110 pupils at the public expense, all these pupils being selected by a severe competition. But we should remember that the *École Normale* occupies the place of both our Universities, and that the real representatives in England of the French 110 are the scholars and fellows of Balliol and Oriel, of Trinity and of King's. The *École Normale* spends 12,300*l.* on the education and maintenance of these 110 students, who, we have no doubt, are quite deserving of the very best education that can be provided in France; but it should not be forgotten that Oxford alone gives away at least 20,000*l.* a-year in prizes for learning. Mr. Arnold, however, thinks that the establishment of such a school should be the first step in the improvement of our teaching staff. The *École Normale* again cannot be considered fairly but as a strict political engine; the lectures and the studies are carefully guarded by the Minister, and if the pupils too warmly applaud a too liberal professor, the school is liable to be broken up, and the career of many inoffensive students thereby ruined. Moreover, it is well known at the English Universities that men who have distinguished themselves in their collegiate course are ever leaving as soon as they can, to fill the posts of head or second masters throughout the great schools of England; not a few of the best newer schools being, at this very moment, under the control of men trained at Rugby or Shrewsbury.

Those who are interested in the discussions relative to Homer and his presumed works, which have now prevailed with more or less vehemence throughout educated Europe for more than a hundred years, will do well to turn their attention to the two most recent publications on this subject during the past year by K. F. Ameis at Leipzig, "Homer's *Ilias* für den Schulgebrauch erklärt," and F. K. Paley, "On the comparatively late date and composite character of our *Iliad* and *Odyssey*." These are, doubtless, small works by the side of the contributions of Wolf, of Heyne, of Welcker, and, in his own peculiar way, of even Mr. Gladstone; but they have their value as handing on the controversy, with many new thoughts and new inferences, to the most recent period. It would be impossible to give in this place any details of the present form of the great inquiry into the unity or the diversity of these famous poems, or into the legendary history of their reputed author. We may, however, remark that the far wider knowledge, at the present time, of the interconnexion between the different languages we call by the one generic name of Indo-European—a knowledge wholly unknown when Wolf wrote his famous "*Prolegomena*"—enables us to arrive at clearer notions of the agreements and disagreements (and their reasons) between the two principal dialects of the Homeric poems, the *Æolic*

and the Ionic. With regard to the date of these epics, a tolerably general conclusion has been arrived at, viz. that the *Odyssey*, as a compilation, is considerably later than the *Iliad*. Many early customs prevalent in the latter are found to have died out in the former, and this is peculiarly true when we look at the political notices incidentally alluded to. Thus, in the *Iliad*, we see the primitive constitution—the military commander—the council of elders—the assembly which listens to the chiefs, and obeys or grumbles; in fact much the same subdivisions of power as in Rome, into magistrate, senate, and *comitia*. In the *Odyssey*, the popular element of the *Agora* is already clearly established; it has abundant freedom of speech and action, and is under only a nominal sort of control on the part of the elders. Lastly, the Asiatic type of despotism shadowed forth in the story and character of Priam has no representation any where. With regard to Mr. Paley's particular views, great scholar as he unquestionably is, we must be allowed to say that we think many of them paradoxical in the extreme. Thus he believes that "the compiler of our Homer was an Asiatic living about, but probably later than, the time of Herodotus," and that the only "Homer" known to Pindar, Herodotus, and the Tragedians were the great body of cyclic poems, out of which, in his opinion, our "*Iliad*" and "*Odyssey*" were formed. Moreover, he actually goes the extraordinary length of supposing that a certain Antimachus of Colophon was the probable or possible author of the two poems. It would seem that Paley's choice of Antimachus is any thing but fortunate. The poem this man really wrote, the *Thebaid*, was well known in ancient times, and his treatment of epic subjects was considered by the ancient critics as the very opposite to that of Homer. Thus Plutarch contrasts his stiff and laboured manner with Homer's ease and freedom, and Quintilian is no less decided in his condemnation.

The "Political Sketches of the State of Europe from 1814 to 1867," by Count Munster, contain a valuable *résumé* of the history of very important periods of modern Continental transactions, and seem, so far as we can judge, to be most accurate and honest. Certainly the Germany of 1814 was a very different place from the Germany of 1867. The Holy Alliance is gone; three Dynasties and one Free City, Hanover, Hesse Cassel, Nassau, and Frankfurt, respectively, have ceased to retain any separate independence. Some twenty-five states north of the Maine have been compressed. Ere long the rest will be absorbed, and there will be but one German power from Coblenz to Memel. We may regret the means whereby Bismarck has attained his ends; we may think that Prussia, under his guidance, has shown little compunction in her dealings with the unfortunate Danes and with some other minor States; but we cannot affect to grieve over this change, the more so, that Count Munster, an old Tory, evidently does not wish the old times back again.

"The Records of the Abbots of the Monastery of St. Alban's, compiled by Thomas Walsingham in the reign of Richard the Second," now edited—and extremely well edited—by H. T. Riley. Vol. II., comprising from A.D. 1290 to 1349, is one of those very curious descriptions of mediæval life which have been long known to professed antiquaries and black-letter lawyers, but which have only recently been brought out for the intelligent study of other readers, mainly owing to the impulse given in this direction, as we have already stated, by the exertions of the present Master of the Rolls. We must confess that the picture of life at St. Alban's in the beginning of the fourteenth century does not give one much idea of the holiness which many persons imagine

was generally found in monastic establishments. We find the monks in battle royal with the populace (obviously an ancient gown and town row) because the commonalty set up mills of their own to grind their corn instead of bringing it all to the Abbot's mills. We find the abbots themselves flirting with gay ladies from the neighbouring county, and entertaining them liberally at their tables. We find the ladies trooping in from the country no wise unwilling to share, so long as he pleased, the abbot's good cheer. Nor was the cloister itself free from the entrance of these dangerous snares; highly born and titled dames and damsels being permitted to repair to the sacred precincts, whenever they wished to consult a favourite brother. The book abounds with good stories, one of the best of which is how a rich lady in the neighbourhood, fearing her house might be robbed by burglars, sent a heavy chest to be stored in the Treasury of St. Alban's, and how, sometime afterwards, when things were a little quieter, she came to the Treasury, and, to the horror of the surrounding monks, showed it, when opened, to contain only sand and lead. "I put nothing in the chest," said she in reply to their cries of amazement, "but lead and sand; and I did this to be safe from thieves generally!" We are not told whether the monks accepted this questionable compliment with a good grace, but we suspect they were wise enough in future not to receive deposits without knowing what like they really were.

Dr. Davidson's "Introduction to the Study of the New Testament," in two volumes, which completes his former work, in three volumes, on the Old Testament, is, we fear, one of a class which will not really satisfy any one. The adherents to the Strauss notions, and the advanced thinkers, not to say infidels, of modern Germany, will complain of it as not going nearly far enough—as having accepted essential parts of their theories, apparently without the courage to carry them to their legitimate and necessary conclusions; the maintainers of the old view—of that bound up with every Church, Greek, Roman, or Protestant—will condemn it, as condescending to views advocated by men who have practically rejected Christianity, in rejecting the miracles upon which it relies for its evidence. We must also admit that Dr. Davidson is, to our mind, singularly indistinct and inconclusive; so that it is very hard to say, in many sentences, what is the definite meaning he wishes us to accept as his own. At the conclusion of his volumes, we are still left in doubt as to what he is himself; perhaps, we shall not offend the laws of charity when we presume him to be a Christian, because, though he will not say so definitely and decisively, he clearly inclines to the belief that portions of the New Testament have been given to man by Revelation, and, therefore, as containing matter which must be considered supernatural. At the same time, there are not a few other passages from which it would be impossible to divine of what religion the writer really is.

The third and fourth volumes of Kinglake's "Invasion of the Crimea" will please those who were content with the former volumes, and those only. We find in it the same picturesque description, but the same want of accuracy in details; only there is this in favour of the present volumes, that we do not meet with abuse like that heaped in the former ones on the devoted heads of Napoleon and St. Arnaud. Historically these volumes take the reader to the end of the Balaklava charge.

Among the works of less importance on Historical, Biographical, or Miscellaneous subjects which have issued from the press either in this year or towards the close of the preceding, we may briefly enumerate the following, premising

that many of them will be found not wanting in interest to the more special class of readers to whom they have been addressed.

"Saints and Sinners," by Dr. Doran, two vols. A very interesting collection of anecdotes drawn from all sorts of sources; just the kind of book which might have been expected from Dr. Doran's previous literary productions.

"Memorials of the Rev. V. B. Shrewsbury," by his son, John V. B. Shrewsbury. A fair notice of a good, hard-working, but not very discreet Methodist preacher.

"The Church and the World;" Essays on questions of the day, by various writers. Edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley, M.A. A collection of writings which will be doubtless accepted by the Ritualists with the favour they deserve.

"The American Beaver and his Works." By Lewis H. Morgan. This, though an American work, has naturally had a considerable circulation in this country, and deservedly too, as it contains a most valuable account of one of the most energetic little animals in existence.

"Lord Byron, judged by the Witnesses of his Life," two vols. This is a work, long expected as long promised, by the famous Countess Guiccioli. It adds little to what we knew of Byron; and, considering who the writer was, and what her chances of knowing were, we put it down again with no little disappointment.

Plowden, Walter C. "Travels in Abyssinia," &c. &c. This book, by a former English Consul in Abyssinia, will repay reading at the present time, when our memories are naturally full of the exploits of our own army. It may also correct some notions about the people of the country which have been somewhat widely spread about.

"Benjamin Franklin, Autobiography of." Edited by John Bigelow. It is not clear how far this work is to be considered authentic, but the balance of the evidence is in favour of its having been a sort of rough draft of the original MS. The Autobiography which has been usually, we may say always, accepted as genuine, was published many years since.

Marcus Kean. "Towers and Temples of Ancient Ireland."

Bajkuli, C. W. "A Summer in Iceland." Translated by the Rev. M. R. Barnard.

Blackburn, H. "Artists and Arabs."

Nettleship, J. T. "Essays on Robert Browning's Poetry." Clever and ingenious papers, by a young but ripe Oxford scholar.

Rogers, J. E. Thorold. "A Manual of Political Economy for Schools and Colleges"—who, we firmly believe, would be far better employed on their history and mathematics, than by taking Mr. Rogers for their guide and master.

Smith, Goldwin. "The Reorganization of the University of Oxford." A book by a kindred spirit with the writer last noticed. *What may be the future of Oxford, beset as she now is by foes without, and betrayed and misrepresented by far more treacherous friends within, we cannot presume to say; but, we devoutly hope that ages may pass away before her "reorganization" be carried out as Mr. Goldwin Smith would desire.

Freeman, E. A. "History of the Norman Conquest of England." So hard a student as Mr. Freeman has repeatedly shown himself to be could hardly produce a work that was not worthy of perusal. His present one is no exception to his previous writings, but is smart, clear, and entertaining. We are not sure that he has added much original matter to what was known before; but what he has done, he has done well.

"Journal of a Voyage to the Mediterranean by Sir Kenelm Digby, 1628," edited by John Bruce, F.S.A., is a curious relic lately discovered in MS. form among the collections of W. W. E. Wynne, Esq. It is interesting, though not rich in detail, and has, we need hardly add, been edited right well by the experienced hands of Mr. Bruce.

Senior, Nassau W. "Journals, Conversations, and Essays relating to Ireland," a very clever and amusing book, which, if carefully read, would at the present time be of some use in correcting numberless fallacies and sophisms recently put forth anent Irish tenure of land, and the English Church in Ireland.

Blanc, Henry, M.D. "Narrative of Captivity in Abyssinia." This book ought to be read in connexion with Mr. Consul Plowden's Memoirs noticed above. We have heard so much of the doings of King Theodore during the present year that Dr. Blanc's book does not seem to add much to our knowledge. When, however, the world has forgotten about Theodore, Dr. Blanc's book will be useful in refreshing its memory of a very disagreeable story.

Robertson, J. B. "Lectures on the Life of Edmund Burke."

Marshall, John. "Outlines of Physiology," two vols.

Dashwood, J. B. "The Thames to the Solent, by Canal and Sea; or, The Log of the Una boat 'Caprice.'" There is quite a literature of its own now by daring and ingenious men who have been up and down all sorts of out-of-the-way lakes and rivers in small boats, sometimes by themselves, like Macgregor. Of this class the one before us is a good specimen, albeit that it contains no very startling adventures.

Bateman, J. "The Life of the Rev. H. Venn Elliott." A life of a good hard-working man, who must still be well remembered by hundreds in the seat of his long ministry, Brighton. We fear were Mr. Elliott to wake up again some morning and revisit the scenes of his former life, the Ritualistic follies in course of perpetration there would awaken him to even fiercer indignation, than did, some seventeen years ago, his horror lest the Crystal Palace should be opened on a Sunday.

Bremer, Charlotte. "Life, Letters, &c., of Frederika Bremer." We suspect that Miss Bremer's character can be better judged from her numerous works than from this dull and ponderous biography.

Every one will rejoice at the continuance of the Wellington Despatches by a third volume which refers to the critical period from December, 1825, to May, 1827. The chief occurrences related in these papers are the Duke's mission to St. Petersburg at the accession of the Emperor Nicholas, the death of the Duke of York and the appointment of the Duke of Wellington as Commander-in-Chief, the selection of Canning to succeed Lord Liverpool as Premier, involving as it did the resignation of some of the ablest of his former colleagues, and the negotiations between England and Russia with reference to the Greek rebellion.

"The Manual of the Ancient History of the East till the Median Wars," by F. Lenormant, in two volumes, is a very clever and thoroughly French sketch of the earliest period of the world. It must not, we think, be looked at as more than a sketch, but, as such, it is well done. The author, strange to say, seeing that he is a Frenchman and secretary to the Institute, believes in Moses and in Genesis, not to say in not a few other things, the "wise men" of this land have long since pitched over as delusions.

"The Conscience—Lectures on Casuistry," by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, is well worth reading as is nearly all that comes from the pen of Mr. Maurice. There

is not much that is new in these lectures, but we mark the same vigorous intellect, the same clearness of perception, and the same high morality which has enabled Mr. Maurice for so long to do so much good work.

A new edition of Mr. Edward Walford's "County Families of the United Kingdom" enables us to call renewed attention to one of the most useful compilations of this hard-working and painstaking student. Considering the range of Mr. Walford's labours, we may well congratulate him on the few errors discernible in his excellent work.

John Franklin Swift, latest of San Francisco (we presume), has written a book entitled "Going to Jericho." His sketches of various parts of the world besides Jericho are often entertaining, some times decidedly broad, and always Yankee. Many, too, of his tales belong to the Munchausen school.

"A Chapter of Autobiography," by the Right Hon. W. H. Gladstone will, we imagine, satisfy no one who is not prepared to hand himself over, body and soul, to the present views and doctrines of the Premier.

Mr. C. L. Eastlake's "Hints on Household Taste in Furniture, &c.," contain under a style often serio-comic much valuable information and still more valuable suggestions as to what decoration is in good taste and what is not. We fear, however, that in this country the rapid growth of commercial wealth, will long interfere with the cultivation of a really pure taste; while, in many of our more common productions, the steam-engine, which has introduced cheapness, has, at the same time, banished the minute care given to such work by our forefathers.

"The Sacred City of the Hindus," by the Rev. M. A. Sherring, is an interesting account of the ancient town of Benares, with a learned preface by Mr. Fitz-Edward Hall.

"The Architectural History of Ely Cathedral," by the Rev. D. J. Stuart, will repay attentive study on the part of all who have a taste for either the early annals of our country or for ecclesiastical architecture. Indeed, it may be doubted whether there is any church in England, except probably Westminster Abbey, which surpasses Ely in historical interest, while details from the carved work at Ely are known to have supplied models to many other English buildings.

"Ships and Sailors, Ancient and Modern," by G. C. Cotterill and E. D. Little, is an entertaining book made up of all kinds of sketches drawn from very varied sources, but more or less connected with ships, as the title suggests.

"The Great Unwashed," by a journeyman engineer, will attract many readers other than those of the classes to whom it more especially refers. It is written by a man who, evidently, has had long experience among the people about whom he writes, and shows also considerable literary ability. The writer is strongly opposed to most forms of trades' unions, and, especially, to the spouters and stump orators, of whom we have heard so much since the Reform League forced itself into notice.

"The Upright Man," a memorial of the Rev. Corbett Cooke, Wesleyan Minister. We feel persuaded this excellent man, whom we regret not to have known or heard of while in the flesh, was all that his congregation—his best judges—seem to have thought him. Yet still we object to the title. Heads of churches or sects—if energetic enough—are generally deemed "the" men by their happy followers. Nor can we doubt that, if nicely questioned, Dr. Cumming or Cardinal Antonelli, his Grace of Canterbury or his Holiness the Pope, would aver that they were each and all, in their respective positions, "upright men."

"Walks in the Black Country," by Elihu Burritt, is a fair description of this marvellous district of iron manufacture. It is written for Americans, and will probably be more read across the Atlantic than here.

Curtius, Prof. E. "The History of Greece." The boys of the next generations, to say nothing of the *alumni* of our universities, will not be able to plead for their ignorance lack of the materials of Greek history. We should have thought that Grote and Thirlwall, not to forget Mure, would have been enough for most students, but now we have a fourth historian in Professor Curtius, who has produced an able work, well translated by Mr. A. W. Ward.

Spedding, James. "Life of Bacon," vols. III. and IV. The new volumes keep up, as might have been expected, the full character of the earlier ones, but are much over-laden and far too copiously illustrated by notes, and by detached essays on all sorts of subjects on which it pleases Mr. Spedding to write dissertations. We regret this: every Englishman must be anxious for the fame of Lord Bacon, and Mr. Spedding has done much for this. At the same time few readers will have leisure for volumes so ponderous and so closely printed as these last.

Whympier, F. "Travels in Alaska." These travels in a district of North-West America, but little hitherto known, will interest the politician scarcely less than mere readers of travels. The territory in question is that which has been recently bought by Mr. Secretary Seward for eighteen dollars the square mile, and which has been praised or denounced as valuable or worthless, chiefly as the talkers loved or hated Seward and his policy. Mr. Whympier thinks that, on the whole, though its climate is very severe, it will be found to pay under the energetic rule of the Americans. Sitka, its capital, possesses the curious property of having two Sundays in each week; the Russians having reached Alaska from the east, while the Anglo-Saxons came from the west. The Russian Sunday therefore falls on our Saturday. The same is, we believe, true of some of the Dutch Settlements in the East Indies.

Sharpe, Samuel. "History of the Hebrew Nation and of its Literature." Mr. Sharpe is well known for his many papers and books in illustration of Egyptian history, and for the publication of numerous transcripts of the Hieroglyphical Inscriptions, a species of work, in the furtherance of which, he has shown great liberality and zeal. Scholars, indeed, differ much as to the value of his own knowledge on such matters; but no one can deny him the possession of great, though often misapplied, erudition. We are not sure that he will gain much credit by the present publication, especially as the advocates of his views can fall back upon his master in such theories, M. Ewald.

"Megha-Dūta; or, Cloud-Messenger," by Kalidasa. Translated by Colonel Ouvry. This famous sanskrit poem was first translated into English verse many years ago by the late Professor H. H. Wilson. Colonel Ouvry has now given us a translation in prose which is accurate, though rather dry.

Chesney's, Lieut.-Col., "Waterloo Lectures" throw light on many points which have been hitherto misunderstood, especially as to the actual service which the Prussians did towards the close of that memorable day. He has also shown that, if English writers on this subject have made abundant blunders, these are not comparable with the studied falsehoods put forth by Buonaparte himself at St. Helena, with the view of exalting his own skill and prowess, and of discrediting the real ability and good actions of his Marshals.

The "Collection of English Chronicles," by Jehan de Waurin, which has been

recently translated from the French by William Hardy, will be interesting to most of our readers, as containing, among other things, a personal account of the Battle of Agincourt, on October 25, 1415: at this great victory De Waurin was himself present, and confirms the popular estimate of the numbers in the French and English armies, showing that the former were from five to six to one as many as the latter. The loss on the English side he makes 1600, that on the French 10,000, not counting "*varlets*."

Clement Williams, "*From Burmah to Western China*," gives an account of his attempt to open out a trade-route between the Irawaddy and the Yang-tse-Kiang, an attempt which we have every reason to think would have met with complete success had he been heartily supported by the Indian Government. Clearly, it would be a great saving could we avoid the voyage round from Bengal to Eastern China.

"*Sir Walter Raleigh, Life of*," by Edward Edwards. Mr. Edwards is one of the most hard-working of literary men, as a mere inspection of the works he has been engaged on during the last twenty-five years will amply show to any one who will look into a good catalogue of books. We are, therefore, glad to add that his *Life of Raleigh* does not detract from his known previous merits, and exhibits great powers of research, and much ability in stating the results of these researches. We fear, however, that two thick volumes, closely printed, of nearly 1300 pages, will deter a considerable number of students from giving them the attention they well deserve.

"*Principles at Stake*," by George H. Sumner, is a collection of Essays on principles, as nearly as possible, opposite to those enounced by Mr. Orby Shipley, to which we have already called attention. On the whole, it must be confessed that the papers collected by Mr. Sumner are much more like what we should expect from a Clergyman of the Church of England than those in Mr. Shipley's volume.

The "*Memoir of the Right Honourable Hugh Elliot*," by the Countess of Minto, will well repay perusal, as the life of a man who saw perhaps more of life, both high and low, than has been the lot of many. Born in the reign of George II., and surviving till the accession of William IV.; at school in France with Mirabeau; in Paris, first, with David Hume and Horace Walpole; at Berlin, ere the death of Frederick the Great; still later, in Paris during the commencement of the Revolution; in 1803, with Nelson in the Victory; an employé at a dozen Courts; and, finally, Governor first of the Leeward Islands and then of Madras, on his return whence he visited St. Helena, but declined to visit Napoleon "as the greatest enemy his country had ever had, and a curse to Europe;" Mr. Elliot's story comprehends no small portion of the most interesting times of modern European history.

"*Bible by Coverdale, MDXXXV.*," by Francis Fry, is an excellent addition to English Bibliography.

"*Ten Thousand Wonderful Things*," by E. F. King, is exactly the book to suit an age in which novel reading has far outstripped (for a large number of the young of both sexes) the serious study of history, language, or physical science. It is also amusingly inaccurate, both in statement and reference. Our wonder is, not that Mr. King, who puts M.A. after his name—possibly to throw dust in the eyes of the ignorant who will revel in this book—should have named all his stories and extracts "*wonders*," but that he should have found any publishers heedless enough to print and circulate them for him.

"Indian Polity," a view of the system of Administration in India, by G. Chesney, will no doubt find many admirers. We despair, however, of any real good being effected by the centralization suggested.

J. H. Blunt. "A Key to the Knowledge and Use of the Holy Bible." A good and useful work for those who have not accepted the Colenso-Davidson views. Ordinary readers of the Bible will thank Mr. Blunt for his plain re-assertion of facts that few people, thirty years ago, had begun to call in question.

"Benjamin Disraeli, Life of," by J. McGilchrist. The last personage, we should have thought, whose life *could* have been written before his death. Nor, though we appreciate many of the late Prime Minister's acts better than do some of his opponents, do we believe, that either he or the Conservative party owe, or would be ready to give, any thanks to Mr. McGilchrist for his present lucubrations. It is a weak and feeble essay, though we are told Mr. McGilchrist is a practical hand at such compilations.

"The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ," by the Rev. Stanley Leathes, being the Boyle Lectures for 1868, is an excellent work by an able Hebrew scholar. We have great pleasure in commending it to all those whose critical notions, unfed by *réchauffés* of German theologies, have not yet forgotten the value of "*stare super antiquas vias.*" •

Henderson, Captain J., in his "History of the Rebellion in Ceylon," gives an account of the deeds of some of Lord Torrington's employés, especially of a certain Captain Watson, which we should be glad to believe an exaggeration: but, from what we remember of the time, and of the obloquy the Governor incurred, though protected at home by his Whig friends, we fear it is but too true. Look at the story of this miserable revolt and of the Jamaica insurrection. In the one case, poor Eyre is to be ruined in purse—thank God, not in character—while Lord Torrington has strutted before the Queen since then for years, an irreproachable Lord in Waiting!

W. D. Sweeting (the Rev.), in his "Notes, &c., on the Parish Churches round Peterborough," has written a book which, if we mistake not, will be known a long way off from Peterborough. Beautifully illustrated with photographs, the historical text is given with great accuracy, and with much force and precision. Mr. Paley has already given some account of the churches of this district, but there was much more still to be gathered into the garners of Mr. Sweeting.

With this admirable work may be contrasted Mr. English's "Light on the Historians and History of Crowland Abbey, and an account of Burgh (now Peterborough)," &c., a very meagre and feeble book, with many odd things in it. Of these the oddest, surely, is the idea that "the Romans were for the most part much like ourselves, and spoke a dialect which differed as little from our own as the English of Londoners differs from the tongue of the Scots!"

"Summers and Winters in the Orkneys," by Daniel Gorrie, is a work written by a man who is well acquainted with his subject, and is therefore interesting. This is also composed in a pleasant and lively style.

But of books of travels which have recently issued from the press, that by Lady Di Beauclerk, "A Summer and Winter in Norway," will, we think, be deemed the most enjoyable. Perhaps, scarcely any book has been published, since Lady Eastlake's notes of her tour along the Baltic, which conveys to the reader such a pleasant idea of the temper and spirit of the writer. The sketch of the journey is admirably told all through in the simplest, most natural, and most unaffected way; and the thorough appreciation of the magnificent coast

scenery of Norway demonstrates a mind well trained and, therefore, well qualified not only to enjoy herself, but to make her readers follow and envy an enjoyment so genuinely portrayed.

Mr. E. C. Walcott's "Sacred Archæology" is the kind of work we should naturally have anticipated from the profound studies of one of the most laborious of English Archæologists. It is, in fact, a closely printed dictionary, the carefully assorted result of years of labour, devoted to the illustration of the whole of Ecclesiology. The range is naturally enormous, greater, indeed, than could be with ease compressed within the limits of a single work. Yet, for all this, Mr. Walcott's contribution to our general knowledge will be thoroughly appreciated by all students who are desirous of finding succinctly stated what he has well called "A Popular Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Art and Institutions from Primitive to Modern Times." Mr. Walcott, in a modest preface, asks for corrections from those who may detect errors. We do not doubt that this assistance will be afforded to him, and that a second edition will enable him to give to the public a yet more valuable work than his present one. We should add that considering the Herculean task he has undertaken, the errors in his book, though numerous, are such as could hardly with justice to him, be severely judged.

Riley's "Memorials of London and London Life from A.D. 1276 to 1419" is a book of great value as an illustration of the actual life of and in London in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. The public owes its thanks to the Corporation of London, who have given free leave to Mr. Riley to make this full inspection of and these ample extracts from their archives, and who have further ordered the printing and publication of his transcripts to be made "at their sole expense." The book has been thoroughly well done, and with no sparing of labour. We trust that this volume of 700 pages may be considered only as the commencement of a series, and that health and strength may be given to Mr. Riley to persevere in his valuable researches; which, even now, necessitates the re-writing of the history of the City of London during the 140 years he has as yet examined and described.

The Rev. S. C. Malan, if we mistake not, one of the earliest to gain the Boden Sanskrit scholarship at Oxford, has been long and favourably known as a most accomplished Oriental scholar, as well as an excellent draughtsman, who has seen much and drawn much of Eastern life and manners. His present translation from the Armenian of "The Life and Times of St. Gregory the Illuminator," will, no doubt, maintain his reputation as a scholar. We fail, however, to see the value of a work which chronicles to the full the fables and superstitions of the early Christian people of Armenia, but which cannot be said to do much more. Mr. Malan is thoroughly competent to give to the world a complete history of the Armenian Church, will he do so?

The contributions in 1868 to that class of lighter literature usually known by the name of novels, has been considerable; and, when we look at the actual numbers of such works of fiction, not a few of which have been generally admitted to be, at least, readable, the collection for this year is, probably, as good as that in former years. Among these we may notice the following:—

"Haunted Lives," by Sheridan Le Fanu, a fair representation of the class of stories whereof this writer has made himself a name. "The Bramleighs of Bishop's Folly," by Charles Lever, a lively, pleasant book, by a writer who is often careless to the verge of blunders, but who has rarely printed any thing

which would not be deemed readable. "The Author's Daughter," by Catherine Spence. "Fathers and Sons," by Mr. Turginess, in many senses one of the best books of its class which have been recently put forth. "Bones and I," by Whyte Melville, one of the best stories which this entertaining writer has given to the world. "Moonstone," by Wilkie Collins, a reprint from a serial, but one, notwithstanding, quite fit to have a separate place for itself, with a story, indeed, improbable and in some degree sensational, but carefully worked up and admirably written.

"Wallencourt," by W. Pratt.

"The Lost Link," by Tom Hood, a name memorable in the literature of the nineteenth century; a worthy son and follower of a father who, in his own time, has had no equal, and need fear no imitator. We do not think Tom Hood could write what his father wrote, but we thank him for a pleasant, carefully-performed work.

"First Love and Last Love," by Mr. Grant, is a good specimen of the style with which he has made us familiar. It will not add to, or detract from his fame.

We cannot congratulate Mr. H. Kingsley on his "Mathilde," which is, to say the least, feeble in scheme and execution; but we think Miss Braddon's "Dead Sea Fruit" less nauseous, because less sensational, than many of the tales whereby she has won renown with a certain class.

"Foul Play," by Messrs. Reade and Boucicault, is a singular instance of misplaced talent. We defy any one to unravel the mysteries of this composite jumble, which reflects little credit on Mr. Reade, and is altogether beneath the credit of so accomplished a plot-monger as Mr. Boucicault.

Miss Annie Thomas, who, like some actresses and singers, has found her maiden more profitable than her married name, has added to the list of her former works, "Dower House," which is a good tale, singularly unpleasant, however, to read. "One too Many," by Armah Grey, is good; and so, with some qualification, we may call "Tonic Bitters," by Legh Knight. Mrs. Craven's "Sister's Story," Mrs. Newby's "Only Temper," will attract some readers, but we doubt much whether this happy result will be attained by Lady Wood's "Sorrows of the Sea." Other novels which have obtained a certain amount of popularity are the following:—Mrs. Dutton Cook's "Over Head and Ears;" Miss Muloch's "Woman's Kingdom;" Miss Braddon's "Run to Earth;" Mrs. Henry Wood's "Anne Hereford;" Mr. Moy Thomas's "Fight for Life;" Mr. George MacDonald's "Seaboard Parish;" Mr. Lancaster's "A Screw Loose;" Mr. Arthur Help's "Realmah;" and Mr. Jeaffreson's "A Noble Woman."

W. R. Russell—"Adventures of Dr. Brady"—has produced a story which will be read perhaps more from sympathy with a writer so well and so justly known in various fields of literature, than from any special interest in the tale itself. The well-known "Times Correspondent," over whose pages we have hung so often and with so much pleasure, is sure to write well whatever he undertakes. We may, however, have our doubts whether he has greatly increased his fame by turning from his true path as the chronicler of passing and stirring events to the lighter fields of fiction.

"Breakspare," by Guy Livingstone, will assuredly not improve the reputation of the writer, whose first literary effort has given him the patronymic whereby he is best known.

"Faith and Science," by Gilbert Sutton, is a collection of Essays on various important moral subjects, and indicates extensive reading and much skill in the

selection of what is most apposite to the question the writer is discussing. At the end of the volume is a "critique on the writings and life of the late Rev. Mr. Robertson, of Brighton," in which the reader will find a just and sensible estimate of that good and true man.

On the subject of Poetry there is less to record this year than usual, comparatively few works of great power having made their appearance, though of poetasters there has been the customary inexhaustible crop. Possibly the poems which will endure the longest, are also, curiously enough—or rather will be, when finished,—the longest poems in the English language. These are Mr. Morris's "Earthly Paradise," and Mr. Browning's "Ring and the Book." The first, we have little doubt, will take its place among our best writers, whether for the brilliancy of the descriptions to be found in it or for the exquisite melody of its verses. One volume only is as yet published, but this volume gives excellent promise for the future. Of Mr. Browning's Poems, of which one volume, too, is "out," we would rather say nothing till we see what the four promised remaining ones are like. Both poems, we may add, are expected to comprehend something like 20,000 verses. Two compilations of ballads, those of "The Legendary Ballads of England and Scotland," by Mr. J. S. Roberts, and "Scottish Ballads and Songs," by Mr. Maidment, are worthy of notice as being far superior to the ordinary character of such collections. Of the two we are inclined to consider the former the most completely executed. We also notice with pleasure Mr. MacDonald's "The Disciple, and other Poems," affording as they do evidence of a highly cultivated mind, and of an ear attuned to harmonious sounds; hence, though his fancies are sometimes far-fetched and overstrained, his verses very rarely lack the proper flow. Nor should we omit to mention a very excellent little book in its way, called "Poems written for a Child, by Two Friends," which will, we hope, soon take the place of the rubbish which, for many years, has been thought advisable for the perfection of youthful tastes. Lastly—though across the Water in their origin—we cannot wholly omit Longfellow's "New England Tragedies," which revive many pleasant recollections of his former writing.

We should like to mention, though not strictly falling within any one of the classes of literature to which we have called attention, the presumed discovery, by Professor Henry Morley, of an unpublished poem by John Milton, written on a blank page at the end of Milton's "English and Latin Poems," printed in 1645, and now in the British Museum. The world was naturally at first taken aback, and was inclined to accept the statements of the distinguished Professor. A more careful examination, however, by the experienced scholars of the MSS. Room in that institution showed clearly that it was a fallacy to suppose the writing Milton's; that the "J. M." for John Milton was really S. M. or P. M., and that the Professor had, therefore, found a mare's nest, though supported in his view by the discriminating editor of the "Athenæum."

In concluding this concise summary of the first branch of our subject—the Literature of the year 1868—we may be allowed to quote the following statistics from the "Publisher's Circular," which better than any thing else demonstrates at once the total number of books issued, and of the classes into which they may be divided. "Our record of title-pages," we read in it, "for the past year shows that 4581 new books and new editions have been published in Great Britain during 1868, exclusive of mere re-issues and entries for alterations of price, and importation of foreign printed books; of this number of 4581, no less than

one-fourth were issued during the last two months of the year, viz. 569 in November, and 534 in December; and, adding to this total of 4581 new books and new editions, 408 importations of original American books, and 103 registrations of alterations in price on re-issue, we have a gross total of 5092 works which have passed through our columns during the year, the full transcript of the title-page of each being copied *verbatim* for the guidance of the literary world. A classification of the titles comprising this total gives nearly one-fourth of the whole as upon theological subjects, viz. 984; to education, philology, and classical literature, 446; juvenile works, 524; novels, 408; law, 340; arts and sciences and Fine Art books, 429; trade and commerce and political economy, 397; travel and geographical research, 238; history and biography, 273; poetry and the drama, 217; year-books and annual publications, 225; medicine and surgery, 193; miscellaneous, 418.

ART.

THE Art of the year 1868 will be best represented by an account of the different Exhibitions which have taken place, of the principal works which have been performed, and of the chief artistic books which have been issued from the Press. We will take first the Exhibitions. The principal exhibitions have been the following:—The National Portrait (third and last series); the Leeds Exhibition; that of the Royal Academy; The Society of British Artists; The Society of Painters in Water Colours; The French Gallery; The Architectural Exhibition; and the Winter Exhibition. Of each of these we shall give some account, with the object of commemorating, so far as our space admits, the most notable productions of the year.

The Exhibition of National Portraits, for the third and last time this year, naturally claims our first attention. It will be remembered that the exhibitions of the previous years have brought the pictures down to the close of the last century, and that, therefore, the year 1868, strictly speaking, was to comprehend the portraits of such persons only who were alive in 1800, but had died before 1868. During, however, and after the exhibitions of former years, it had been felt that there must be many pictures latent, mostly in private houses in remote parts of the country, which it would be well should be seen if possible; it was therefore wisely resolved to collect together all of these that could be found, and to make a supplementary collection to the one intended for the year. This supplementary collection contained, as we shall see, some gems of the purest water, which it is remarkable should have been overlooked in the search made in previous years.

The Third Exhibition comprehended a period far more limited than those that had preceded it; and we must, we fear, admit also, a very marked decadence or falling off in the Art of Portraiture. The former exhibitions had covered a period of more than 500 years; the last only sixty-eight years. At the same time, to the world at large it is likely that the exhibition of 1868 would be the one of, probably, the most real interest, dealing as it did with the portraits of

men and women whom we seem to have known from our earliest years—of people with some of whom we had been on terms of familiar friendship or intimacy—of some to whose voices in the Senate or the pulpit we had often listened, anyhow of persons who distinctly represented our own time and country, and by whose noble or infamous deeds it will hereafter be judged by history. On the other hand, the previous exhibitions had what this one lacked, a special historical and antiquarian interest, and appealed, not in vain, to the intellectual tastes and refined studies of the few. We saw in them the slow step-by-step progress of the Art, beginning from those illustrious foreigners, such as Holbein, who painted many of their greatest works in England, and following on with the rise and progress of the purely English school, which rose to its height under Gainsborough and Sir Joshua Reynolds. It is certainly not pleasant to feel that we are living now during the period when any species of knowledge is, as it would seem, in a state of almost hopeless decline; yet, we must acknowledge, that portraiture by English hands has never, since Reynolds, attained the proportions he had given to it, and that our Lawrences and our Wests, the pride of England in our father's days, really shed but a feeble ray by the side of the glorious works of the great masters at the close of the last century. We will take first the Supplementary Collection, because, sooth to say, they were to us far more interesting than the exhibition proper of the year.

This most remarkable assemblage, containing somewhat more than 300 old portraits, a noble gleanings surely after what had been procured for the two previous exhibitions. And yet we do not believe that even now all that is worth seeing and recording has been found, knowing, as we do, from several remarkable circumstances which have come under our own observation, how comparatively easy it is even for large pictures to be placed aside in the upper rooms of great mansions, and then to be as entirely forgotten as if they had never existed. Of its wealth in mere numbers we can best give an idea by stating that it contained nine new Holbeins, nine Vandykes, several by Lily and Kneller, nine more of Hogarth, and no less than twenty-seven additional paintings by Gainsborough, and thirty-four by Sir Joshua Reynolds. In individualizing for description here a few of the most remarkable of these newly exhibited, if not discovered pictures, we naturally take first the famous picture of Richard II. which has now hung for about a century in the Jerusalem Chamber at Westminster. It will be probably remembered that this picture was shown at the First Exhibition, and created great astonishment, many of our Art critics having evidently never heard of its existence, though hanging, and readily visible, within a mile or two of most of their residences. To the intelligent remarks, however, of some, to whom criticism in the public papers is *not* a profession, is due the fact, that the Dean and Chapter resolved to see whether the old picture could be well cleaned, and with this view called in the aid of a man of experience in such matters, Mr. Merritt, our excellent artist, Mr. George Richmond, R.A., at the same time undertaking, personally to superintend the whole process. Mr. George Scharf, who was present during great part of the operation, has so well described what was done and how it was done, that we shall make no scruple in giving the marvellous results in his own words, from an article he wrote for the "Fine Arts Quarterly Review:"—"Upon a careful examination, and by testing the picture in various parts, Mr. Merritt found that the colours so abundantly laid on were not of any great antiquity. The oldest in the mass would have been about 150 years old, thus carrying us back to the early part of the eighteenth century, and only just before the time when Talman

employed Grisoni to make his drawing for the benefit of the Society of Anti-quaries . . ." The following notes of the change (before and subsequent to Mr. Richmond's cleaning) may perhaps best serve to indicate the chief points of contrast, and the general bearing of the alterations.

" Instead of a large, coarse, heavy-toned figure, with very deep solid shadows, strongly marked eyebrows, and a confident expression (almost amounting to a stare) in the dark brown sparkling eyes, we now have a delicate, pale picture, in carefully modelled forms, with a placid and somewhat sad expression of countenance; grey eyes, partially lost under heavy lids; pale yellow eyebrows and golden brown hair. These latter points fully agree with the King's profile in the small *tempera* Diptych at Wilton, belonging to the Earl of Pembroke. The long thin nose accords with the bronze effigy of the King in Westminster Abbey; while the mouth, hitherto smiling and ruddy, has become delicate but weak, and drooping in a curve, as if drawn down by sorrowful anticipations in the midst of pageantry. Upon the face there is a preponderance of delicate shadow, composed of soft brown tone, such as are observable in early Italian paintings of the Umbrian and Siennese Schools executed at a corresponding period. Indeed the general appearance of the picture now forcibly recalls the productions of Simone Memmi, Taddeo Bartoli, Gritto da Fabriano, and Spinello Aretino.

" Many gratuitous changes seem to have been made by the restorers in various parts of the figure of King Richard; several well devised folds of drapery were quite destroyed through ignorance. The position of the little finger of his left hand, holding the sceptre, was found to have been materially altered. The letters R, surmounted by a crown, strewn over his blue robe, were changed in shape, and the dark spots on his broad ermine cape, were distorted from their primitively simple tapering forms into strange twisted masses of heavy black paint. The globe held in his right hand, and covered with some very inappropriate acanthus leaves, was at once found to be false, and beneath it was laid bare a slightly convex disc of composition gilded and very highly burnished. This, however, was not an original part of the picture. A plain flat globe with its delicate gilding was found hidden still lower; and it was then ascertained that the head of the sceptre and the crown on his head had in like manner been loaded with gold and polished. Beneath these masses of solid burnished gilding, bearing false forms and ornaments unknown to the 14th century, was found the original Gothic work, traced with a free brush in beautiful foliage on a genuine gold surface lying upon the *gesso* preparation coating the panel itself, and constituting a perfectly different crown as well as heading to the sceptre from those hitherto seen. The singular device (for the 14th century) of a fir-cone on the summit of the sceptre has disappeared entirely. The diaper, composed of a raised pattern, decorating the background, coated over with a coarse brown powder, and not even gilded, was found to be a false addition. It was moulded in composition or in cement, possibly as early as the reign of the Tudors. Not only did it stand condemned in itself by clumsiness of workmanship and a reckless fitting together of the component parts, but it was found to have extensively overlaid some of the most beautiful foliage and pieces of ornamentation. The picture is painted on oak, composed of six planks joined vertically."

The Holbeins exhibited on this occasion, if not altogether of greater interest, are admitted by the best judges to be more genuine than the bulk of those shown before. It could hardly be that the whole sixty-three of the First Exhibition had been rightly ascribed; but in deference to the presumed wishes of the

owners, the names assigned to them were retained, it-being left to Mr. Scharf in a paper he subsequently published to dethrone no inconsiderable number of them. Of the nine in the Supplementary Collection, it seems not quite certain whether Lord Taunton's small portrait of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and of a Lady supposed to be the Fair Geraldine" (No. 626) has been correctly denominated; but the portraits of Edward VI., of Protector Seymour, Bishop Stokesley, Lady Guildford, Sir Brian Tuke, and Reskimer are generally admitted to be genuine results of Holbein's inspiration. Moreover, one of these, that of John Reskimer (No. 628), is supported by a drawing which still exists in the Royal Collection. The picture itself is now to be seen at Hampton Court, and was one of the earliest works of the artist after he had settled himself in England. The portrait of Lady Guildford, a companion picture to that of Sir Henry Guildford in the First Exhibition, is one of the best, and is evidently a true and exact rendering of the original subject. That of Bishop Stokesley, which was formerly at Hampton Court, under the name of "Martin Luther," is now preserved at Windsor Castle. Other remarkable paintings by the same unrivalled artist are those of Sir John Bouchier; Lord Berners, the translator of Froissart; of Edward VI. when a child; and of "John Lymden, the last Prior of Reigate" (634). About this last picture a doubt has been suggested whether it was really painted from the life, arising from the fact that it bears two dates, one "1531, Æt. suæ. 65;" the other, "obiit a° dñi 1554." It is, however, possible that the second inscription may have been written on the picture by the then owner as soon as he heard of the Prior's decease.

Lord Dillon contributed two portraits, which were examined with great interest during the exhibition, one of "Sir Thomas Lee of Ireland" (631), the other called "Sir Francis Drake, by Sir Antonio More" (663); the first from the strangeness of his dress, or, we should rather say, of his want of dress, the upper part of his person being only partially covered by a rich silk shirt open to the chest, while his legs and feet are quite bare, at the same time that he wears a helmet and carries a shield and spear. It has been suggested that this strange costume was the one Sir Thomas usually wore when living on his estates in Ireland. The other was, generally, held to be an undoubted work of More, though, with much less probability, a portrait of Drake. Drake is, indeed, represented here in the gayest and smartest dress of the period, and the portrait little resembles those which have been hitherto accepted as genuine. Other noteworthy portraits of a period somewhat later were those of Sir Walter Raleigh (646), of his wife, Elizabeth Throckmorton (640), of Mary of Scotland (681), and of Queen Elizabeth (642). Let no one speak of modern feminine costumes as strange, inappropriate, or inconvenient, who has had the luck to see Queen Elizabeth as she is here depicted, standing on the map of England and habited in a ruff and farthingale of marvellous proportions. When we come to the period of Vandyke we meet with several noble works in that great artist's best style. But, ere we notice these, we ought to mention a remarkable portrait by Dobson (who has been sometimes called the English Vandyke, but who was most truly named by Charles I.—himself one of the best, if not the best, connoisseurs of the time—"Tintoretto"), of himself, Sir Balthazar Gerbier, and Sir Charles Cotterell. Nothing can be more characteristic than these three faces, the best unquestionably being that of Dobson himself. By Vandyke himself there were two portraits of Dudley, fourth Lord North (685); of his sister, Lady Dacre (696); of Lord Widrington (692); a full length of Waller the poet; with others of the Countess of Carlisle, and of her sister, the Countess of Leicester,

the mother of Algernon Sidney. The heroes and heroines of the Commonwealth were more than usually represented, Lady Frankland Russell, herself a lineal descendant of the Protector, having sent a large contribution to this exhibition. Thus we have portraits of the Protector when a child of two years old; of Bridget Cromwell, the Protector's eldest daughter; of Frances Cromwell, Lady Russell; of Mary Lady Fauconberg; of Richard and Henry Cromwell; and last, not least, of that gallant follower of the exiled Stuarts, James Graham, of Claverhouse, best known as "Bonnie Dundee."

Nor are these all; in the list of subjects of this date we find Richard Baxter, Robert Nelson, Hugh Peters, Nell Gwynne, and Lady Coventry, with many others we have not time to record. Of a later period we notice many Dutchmen, the friends of the Prince of Orange, characteristic alike of their native country and of their habits. Among these a portrait of Sir W. Temple, by Lely, admirable both in style and execution; of Bishop Atterbury, by Kneller, which seems hardly an adequate rendering of the lineaments of that eminent man, a defect still more evident in this painter's treatment of the group of Lord and Lady Derwentwater and of their daughter Lady Petrie, figures, doubtless, stately enough, and thoroughly respectable, yet with no fire of genius to illuminate their otherwise commonplace attitudes. The portraits by Hogarth were good, and the subjects generally worthy of his skill. The greatest, no doubt, is the admirable full-length portrait of Captain Coram, which those who are acquainted with the Foundling Hospital cannot fail to remember; and of the once well-known actresses Kitty Clive, and Peg Woffington. Other portraits of considerable interest, and belonging to about the same period, were those of General Wolfe, as a young man, in military attire; of his mother; and of Admiral Byng: a later picture of Wolfe, by West, eighteen years after his death, though much praised by some who have described this exhibition, does not deserve, we think, the fame it obtained. The pictures by Reynolds and Gainsborough fully realized any expectations which may have been raised by those seen in the Second Exhibition. Some, indeed, by each of these great artists were, if any thing, finer than any of the preceding year. By Reynolds we have the famous portrait of Admiral Keppel, painted by his order for presentation to Edmund Burke and his counsel, Lee and Dunning, and now, we are happy to say, the property of the nation; the well-known group of Mrs. Crewe and Mrs. Bouverie, the property of Lord Crewe; of Johnson's friend, Bennet Langton; of Edmund Burke; of Garrick and his wife, painted for Garrick himself; the group of the Grimston family, from Gorbamby; and a lovely profile sketch of Perdita (Mrs. Robinson). Of this latter lady we have also a notable picture by Gainsborough. Of Gainsborough, besides the last-mentioned picture, we have the famous portraits of Lord Howe, and of Quin, the wit; of the beautiful Mrs. Leyborne; of Lady Eardley and her daughter; of the Duchess of Montagu; and of his own wife. There were also portraits by him of Catherine Bell, the mother of Elizabeth Fry, and of her aunt Priscilla Wakefield, whose small books three quarters of a century ago were the delight of our grandmothers.

Perhaps the most curious array of pictures, and one too of which the general public knows the least, were the thirty-one belonging to the Dilettanti Society, and sent by them for exhibition with the wise proviso that they should be hung together. This society, founded in 1754, for "advancing the Fine Arts in England,"—the which end, by the way, we think they have not been very successful in accomplishing, though nearly every man of eminence, as a supposed patron of art,

has belonged to this society between 1754 and the present day,—fortunately, not many years after their first institution as a club, passed a resolution that every member should “make a present of his picture in oil colours,” to be hung in the meeting-room of the society. To this resolution we owe this very curious collection of portraits, most of them of men remarkable in their day. It is true that the painting of the first twenty-three was entrusted to one of their members, Knapton, afterwards keeper of the royal prints and pictures, an artist of moderate powers, who, moreover, chose to paint each of his friends in fancy dresses; but then we have besides these, among the Dilettanti collection, two groups from the pencil of Sir Joshua Reynolds, which justly take the very first rank among those of his pictures which have come down to us.

The portraits in fancy dresses included those of Lord Le Despencer, as a monk, bending over the shrine of Venus; of the Earl of Sandwich, in oriental garments; of Sir Bouchier Wrey, mixing a bowl of punch; of Viscount Galway, as a Cardinal, with the face of a satyr; and of several others in what was probably then thought the correct representation of Roman armour. In the two great groups by Sir Joshua, we may notice the thoroughly well-marked distinction between the work of an indifferent artist, and of the greatest whom England has ever seen, or, we fear, ever will see. The stage trick of the fancy dresses is no more there, and the subjects in them appear in the natural and ornamental dress of the day. In one group we have Sir Joseph Banks, Lord Mulgrave, and Richard Payne Knight, examining ancient gems (probably the very ones now in the British Museum, to whom Knight bequeathed his priceless collection); in the other, Sir Joshua Taylor, Sir Watkin Wynn, and some others standing or sitting round a table, at which Sir William Hamilton is showing his famous book, and some of the Greco-Etruscan vases described and figured in it. Besides these, the most memorable, are others of men famous in their day, such as an admirable likeness of West, by himself; of Sir Joshua, also by himself; of Payne Knight, Sir Harry Englefield, and Lord Dundas, by Sir Thomas Lawrence; and of Morritt, by Sir Martin Shee. To conclude this somewhat lengthy notice of this invaluable addition to the older collection of portraits, we must add that there was also an excellent assortment of Morland’s and of Romney’s best works, a collection of much value as tending to raise the reputation of both these artists, and especially of the former. By the latter were excellent portraits of Law, Bishop of Carlisle, the ablest member, probably, of a very able family; of his distinguished Cambridge friend and brother mathematician, Paley, whose writings, now less read than of old, were among the most remarkable theological works of the latter half of the last century; of the Countess of Mansfield, and of Lady Warwick and her children, and last, not least, of John Wesley; finally, two portraits of Charles Townley, to whom the nation is so largely indebted for the noble collection of sculptures collected by him; one, a rather poor one, by Cosway, in which he and his friends are “examining a torso of Venus placed on an antique altar;” the other, a far better one, by Zoffany, representing him in his library, at No. 7, Park-street, Westminster, the house in which his precious antiques were stored till removed to a special gallery built for them at the Museum, and standing with his brother and friends admiring the well-known “Clytie,” or, as she ought probably to be called, “Antonia.” It was this bust which Townley is said to have carried off for security when there was a fear that his house, as that of a Roman Catholic, would be attacked by Lord Gordon’s rioters in 1780.

Having said so much on the subject of the Supplementary Collection, we can only add here that the change between the early paintings, supported as these were in no small degree by the intermediate genius of Vandyke and his pupil, is much less than that between the great painters of the last century, Reynolds and Gainsborough, and the best of the present time, speaking, of course, generally, because now and then a modern portrait does appear which, for a while, seems to reflect some of that artistic glory, so long in its gradual rise to perfection, so rapid in its final setting. "*Facilis descensus Averni*" will be on the lips of most scholars as well as critics, when they remember what we had, but have lost, or rather what recent Royal Academy Exhibitions have given us in their place. The new series began appropriately enough with a portrait of George IV. as Prince of Wales; and, assuredly, we cannot congratulate lovers of art on the new school of painters his Royal Highness may be supposed to have inaugurated, still less on the men who (with the exception of Sir Martin Shee), since 1800 have, as P. R. A., worn the mantle which once graced the shoulders of Reynolds. We suppose we must notice Lawrence first, having no desire to say aught about West, though possibly Byron was a trifle too severe when he called him—

"Europe's worst dauber, and poor Britain's best."

Of the works by Sir Thomas Lawrence there were no less than seventy specimens. So the world ought to have no doubt what they really gained, or lost, when they exchanged even Romney for him. His *forte* was doubtless his drawing, which from earliest childhood had been remarkable for its freedom and grace; his weakness that he never perfected his art-knowledge, and that he allowed himself to become a limner before he had finished his elementary studies. Yet, in one sense, he was doubtless generally successful, and that was in his likenesses. Wilkie, who knew him well, says of him, "his likenesses were celebrated as the most successful of his time; yet none exalted so much or refined more upon the originals, he wished to seize upon the expression rather than to copy the features." It is difficult, out of so large a number, to select the best, but possibly his portraits of Canning, Sir Humphrey Davy, Sir Astley Cooper, the Marchioness of Wellesley, of Lords Castlereagh and Liverpool, and of Kemble as Hamlet, will be as long remembered as any of his works. Obviously his was not the mind or the temperament that could treat the rugged outlines of an Abernethy, or the majestic brow of Wellington.

After Lawrence, though for the most part contemporary with him, we have a shoal of painters, most of whom, with the exception of Phillips, father and son, and of G. F. Watts, "*Romanorum ultimus*," must be judged famous, not so much for the Art they developed or for the pencils they handled, as for the memorable characters it was their desire, as it was their lot, to hand down to posterity. To some, no doubt, the sitters must have felt as Lord Lyndhurst is reported to have said, when Lord Campbell was publishing the last volume of his deceased Chancellors, that the publication of a narrative so partial was "adding a pang to death." Yet, on the whole, we may well be grateful for no inconsiderable number of the likenesses which have been thus preserved for us. To notice a very few, we may speak well of the elder Phillips's portrait of Lord Byron; of Southey and Coleridge, by the same artist; of Samuel Rogers, by the landscape painter, John Linnell; of Disraeli the elder, Wilson Croker, Peel, Goulburn, Daniel O'Connell, &c. But, probably, we have said enough, the collection has been so recently among us, many of its heroes and heroines have so lately left

the stage of human life, that they hardly as yet would seem to want the recording handiwork of the painter.

The Exhibition of the Royal Academy has in 1868 reached its hundredth year; we are therefore glad to be able to say that, though there were no pictures of startling excellence, the show was on the whole superior to that of some preceding years. This year's exhibition is also worthy of note for the fact that a Royal personage, the Princess Louise, contributed a bust of Prince Arthur, sculptured by her own hands, and very well has our gracious Queen's daughter performed her task, whether we look at the graceful outlines which show a mastery over the mere material, or at the general spirit with which the bust is executed. Pictures there were by almost every Academician, and plenty by those who were not nor ever will be. Prominent among them we may range Maclise, Goodall, Millais, Linnell, Leighton, Frith, and G. F. Watts, without altogether forgetting Sir E. Landseer, Calderon, and Armitage. Mr. Frith has exhibited more than one picture all in his usually brilliant style which has made him so justly popular with people of taste and judgment, the best being, we venture to think, that called "Before dinner at Boswell's lodgings in Bond Street, 1769," wherein the student of history will recognize a number of old friends, Garrick, Goldsmith, Reynolds, with Johnson, appropriately, in the centre. The picture well sustains Mr. Frith's credit, the more so that we know all the faces so well. The day on which the dinner took place is described in the immortal "Memoirs" as that on which the host had to wait long for an expected guest, and on which Goldsmith exhibited his vanity and his bloom-coloured coat. Other good pictures by Mr. Frith are a portrait of Mr. Sothorn, in the scene from "She Stoops to Conquer" where Tony Lumpkin knocks his head against that of Miss Neville, and "Sterne and the Innkeeper's Daughter." The last two show a genuine appreciation of comic situations.

Mr. F. Goodall's two paintings, "Mater Dolorosa" and "Mater Purissima," are exceedingly beautiful in idea, and, at the same time, exquisitely wrought. It is hard to say which should bear the palm of superiority, but we incline to like best the second of the two. The skill and the delicacy shown in the drawing of the face, and the sweetness of expression produced, could scarcely be surpassed. Such painting contrasts we think pleasantly with that of Mr. Maclise's two pictures, "The Sleep of Duncan" and "Madeline after Prayer," works which, while they exhibit the force of this painter, are strongly marked also with what we must deem his defects. The first picture, like too many of his, is staring and theatrical, the figures being grouped together in a singularly complex and confusing manner. The drawing is, however, excellent. The second picture is gentler in treatment, as might have been expected, and the lady is grace itself. Mr. Millais, some time since, treated the same subject, but in a very different way. Mr. G. F. Watts' portrait of Mr. Panizzi, late head of the British Museum, is one of those monuments so rarely seen because so difficult of execution, and which, therefore, marks the period in which they are performed. We know of no portrait of modern times, excepting Sir E. Landseer's of his father, which comes at all near to Mr. Watts' work. It is, indeed, a picture to be hung in the same room with Sir Joshua and Gainsborough, both of whom we feel persuaded would have gladly hailed his presence among them. Those only who were in Mr. Panizzi's almost daily presence during a period of five and twenty years, are competent to speak of the admirable manner in which Watts has rendered the outlines of those rugged, and frequently harsh, features. Mr. Leighton shows great but unequal power

in his contributions to this exhibition, viz. in his "Ariadne," "Actæa," and "Acme and Septimius." We must not deny him the merit of good drawing, but fail to see much artistic excellence, or rather, we should say, a subject worthy of any artistic treatment, in his "Actæa." Those who revel in Etty's productions, or think Reubens's fat women the greatest subjects of painting, because, of course, admitting the freest handling, will probably see in "Actæa" a worthy successor of the first, at least, of these artists. The "Ariadne" was powerfully drawn, and recalled to our eye the reclining figure of the principal one of Phidias's "Fates," but the colour was unpleasant. The "Acme and Septimius," on the other hand were graceful in their rendering, but slightly unmeaning.

Mr. Faed's "Worn out," was a very touching, most melancholy picture, sad, if not sadder, than that "which first cradled the fame" of Mr. Wallis—"The Death of Chatterton"—or Mr. Barker's famous portrait of the death of the lady whose heart he had won; with both of which there were many points of resemblance. The accessories of the story were excellently told, the long watching by the side of the dying child, the shaded candle, the struggle of coming morn-light with its gradually feebler rays, and the manifest care the exhausted parent has shown for his sick boy. Two other less important productions show the usual care Mr. Faed exhibits in dealing with *essential minutiae*. Mr. Calderon's "Ænone" and "The Young Lord Hamlet," show considerable power, but are scarcely in a high style of Art. The second is the one we should, on the whole, prefer. Mr. Millais, out of four or five pictures he has exhibited, has produced but one which will, we believe, remain in the memories of those who have carefully examined them. This one, "Pilgrims to St. Paul's," is alike skilful in its arrangement and pathetic in its treatment. Few can forget the expression of the features of the old sailor who is represented saluting the shrine of his dead admiral. We doubt whether Sir E. Landseer's two pictures of the "Deerhound in the Snow," or of "Rent-day in the Wilderness," will excite much applause, though we would gladly speak in terms of praise of an old and valued public servant. The dog seems feeble when we remember the glories of the Landseers in the Sheepshanks Gallery; on the other hand, we rejoice to hear that Sir Roderick Murchison, for whom the second picture was painted, is proud of the painted story of an anecdote in the life of one of his Scotch ancestors. Still less can we speak highly of the present year's efforts of Sir Edwin's best follower, Mr. Ansdell. Though his "Education against Instinct," the hungry pointer who longs for, but dares not eat, a wounded partridge, shows much ability in technical drawing.

But we must not be tempted beyond our limited space in the desire to give any thing like a detailed memoir of many fairly painted pictures in the exhibition of 1868. We must, therefore, only indicate with a provoking brevity, some miscellaneous pictures which caught our eye pleasantly in our constant rambles through the inconvenient rooms in which we hear that the Academy hope, for the last time, to have exhibited their annual collection. Among these are Mr. J. K. Herbert's "Valley of Moses in the Desert of Sinai," the colouring of which is a striking representation of an Eastern Desert; Mr. H. S. Marks' "Experimental Gunnery in the Middle Ages," which is well painted and interesting; Mr. R. Burchett's "Discovery of the Duke in 'Measure for Measure,'" a clever rendering of one of those wearisome, because apparently never ending, Shakesperian subjects; Miss L. Starr's "Reverie;" Mr. Lehmann's

"Fortune-Teller;" Mr. J. C. Horsley's "Rent-day at Haddon Hall," good, albeit we must admit to being almost as tired of Haddon Hall as of the above mentioned Shakesperian inspirations; Mr. Nicol's "China Merchant," which has much in it worthy of admiration; Mr. Yeames' "Lady Jane Grey in the Tower," perhaps the best picture this young and hard-working artist has as yet elaborated; Mr. Walker's "In the Glen, Rathfarnham Park," a capital piece of painting in every way, and almost worthy of being studied alongside with Mr. Linnell's most beautiful but solitary picture this year, "English Woodlands." The contrast between the lights and shades in Irish and English landscape scenery are admirably brought before the student's eye in these two masterly productions. Lastly, two pictures by M. Legros, "The Refectory" and "Sir Thomas More showing some of Holbein's pictures to Henry VIII.," both excellent; and an important though unpleasant anatomical picture by Mr. Poynder, called "The Catapult." We should add that Mr. Panizzi's wonderful portrait is not the only, though we think far the finest, of Mr. G. F. Watts' works for 1868. We have, however, to record an unexpected instance of the versatility of his genius in a piece of sculpture executed by him, and called "Clytie, marble bust, unfinished," and also in a landscape of no mean excellence. His "Meeting of Jacob and Esau," we confess we do not care about, but his "Wife of Pygmalion," a translation from the Greek is, except in the absurdity of its title, a monument worthy of his great powers. The story of it is worthy telling here, as certainly among "Things not generally known." Many years ago there was among the collection of marbles belonging to the University of Oxford, an antique bust, rather larger than life size, tolerably perfect as to the head, but broken off, if we remember right, across the left breast. This bust, long *perdu* among the old collection, was one day brought to light by Mr. Newton, the present keeper of the Classical Antiquities in the British Museum, and was shown by him to be a genuine Greek bust of rare merit, in date not long subsequent to the remains of the Parthenon. This bust, which, we rejoice to say, now occupies the conspicuous place it deserves in the University galleries, was bequeathed to Oxford by the Countess of Pomfret, and was, therefore, probably of old in the possession of the Earl of Arundel, and had been brought from the East by one of his collectors. Mr. Watts well shows the beautiful effect produced when life is given to the cold, motionless marble by the addition of appropriate colours.

Here we must bring to a conclusion our notice of the paintings in this exhibition, with, however, a brief mention of one or two old and favourite painters, chiefly of sea pieces. To take first our old friend Mr. E. W. Cooke, who exhibits a masterly drawing of ships and boats, which has scarcely ever been surpassed by any one else, contributes two pictures in his very best style, called, respectively, "On the Dutch Coast (Egmont), tide coming in," and "A Scheveling Trawler preparing for Sea," both would make any man of taste or feeling unhappy till he could accompany Mr. Cooke in his next boating excursion. Indeed, what may be called marine pictures mustered strong this year. Thus Mr. G. Eaton, "Confluence of the Bure and the Yare at Great Yarmouth," several pictures by Mr. H. Moore, Mr. J. E. Hodgson's "Off the Downs in the days of the Cæsars," Mr. E. Gill's "Storm and Shipwreck on a Rocky Coast," and two pictures by Mr. L. N. Henry, "Tête de Flandre, near Antwerp," and "By the River-side, Antwerp," are all excellent in their respective ways. We must add that Mr. Creswick well

sustains a well-earned reputation in his pictures of "An old Welsh Shed," and of a "Bend in the River," not to mention Mr. Mason's "Netley Moor," which we have more than once traversed in the pelting rain and pitiless blasts so well described in his picture. Mr. Cope's picture, "The Life's Story," is well painted and the general character of his subject is well rendered, but we must protest against the idea we have seen somewhere broached, that as a story there is any thing at all novel in it. It is in fact nothing else but Othello "holding forth," and Desdemona "listening." "The Disciples at Emmaus," by the same artist, has many points of excellence, as especially the landscape around the scene. We are not, however, satisfied with the treatment of either our Saviour or of His disciples. All Mr. Hook's pictures have this year considerable merit, the more so that he has cast aside an intensely realistic pre-Raffaellite slang, which has clung to him and his works for years. Any one who loves the sea will appreciate the admirable painting of the "Morning after the Gale," while most will derive amusement from his comical picture entitled "Are Chimney-sweepers black?"

We must now turn for a moment to what is generally the most melancholy portion of the Exhibition of the Royal Academy, we mean the specimens of sculptural art, which are placed in the vault, or rather tomb, to which the Royal Academy annually consigns such works as the judges select for exhibition. This sense of sadness, however, would be much increased were it not that so large a number of the works thus exhibited are scarcely worth seeing under any more favourable circumstances. We go on, year by year, and we wonder when the time will come for the production of a really great work; and all we get instead is a number of portraits and busts, some, no doubt, excellent and interesting as portraits, but with scarcely any thing which shows knowledge of the ideal in sculpture, still more any power of grand conceptions. To this, apparently, harsh opinion, we fear this year's collection offers no reply, for surely no one of judgment would echo the praises lavished by some on Mr. Sharp's vulgar statue of Palmerston, Mr. Durham's "At the Spring," Mrs. Thornicroft's "Young Girl," or, perhaps, on even Mr. Munro's rather elegant group of "The Sisters." Were we called on for selection, which most glad we are that we are not, we should, possibly, offend the modern school of Art and their critics, by taking Mr. G. F. Watts' unfinished "Clytie" before all the others, and after him, Woolner's "Elaine." In any case, we should like to call attention to the success of the last named sculptor in the Homeric bas-reliefs, with which the pedestal of Mr. Gladstone's statue for the Bodleian at Oxford is to be enriched. These, though seen in this exhibition, only under the form of plaster-casts, show what we may hope from this sculptor if he will condescend to temper much natural formative ability by the sobering study of the antique.

The Society of Painters in Water-Colours did not make much progress towards excellence in 1868, if we may judge them from the pictures allowed to represent them; on the contrary, remembering, as we cannot fail to remember, the charms of many former years, we can only speak but too feelingly of the disappointment with which we were compelled to notice their shortcomings. Many old friends whom we should have been glad to welcome showed no signs of life by their presence, and those who did exhibit gave us too many pictures, often, no doubt, well-designed, but for the most part singularly uninteresting. The following may be noticed as among the best:—Mr. Carl Haag's "Bedowee's

Devotion" is a good picture, in that painter's usual style, leaving nothing to be desired in felicity and facility of execution. We think though, however, in common with many other critics, that we have had nearly enough of desert scenes, and that an artist of such powers might, with advantage to himself and the public, give us something rather more original. Mr. J. Gilbert's "*Sans peur et sans reproche*" recalls many of his former pictures, with red-robed senators of wise gravity sitting round a council board; and when we have said so much we have said all we need say about it. Mr. T. R. Lamont's "*Return from Fairy-Land*" and "*Flight Postponed*" are both fairly done; the former, however, scarcely tells its story. Mr. J. D. Watson's "*The Tailor's News*" and the "*Ship's Model*" are both good; as is also Mr. Bradley's "*Oxen Harrowing, Sussex*," which is full of life, and is, indeed, one of the truest pictures in the exhibition. Mr. F. Walker's "*Well-sinkers*" is good, as are also Mr. Lundgren's "*Gipsy Bridegroom*" and Mr. Smallfield's "*First Rose of Summer*" and "*Fair Daffodils*." "*The Coal Wharf at Pangbourne*," by A. W. Hunt, will please most people, and is a capital representation of that lovely spot on a bright summer's day; indeed, most of Mr. Hunt's pictures this year come up to his usual average. "*Streatley—Summer Afternoon*" shows many points of equal beauty with the "*Pangbourne*," while his "*Welsh Cromlech*" is a painting of a higher class and very expressive of the mountain limestone country—bright greens and brighter heather—among which these curious relics of ancient superstition are generally found. Other fairly-executed pictures are Mr. T. Danby's "*Over the Hills and far away*," Mr. F. Powell's "*Mull of Cantire*," the painting of the waves in which is very careful, and, no less evidently, the work of a man who has devoted much time to their study. Lastly, we may call attention to Mr. Palmer's illustrations of "*Il Penseroso*" and "*L'Allegro*," which are decidedly good.

The Institute of Painters in Water-Colours had an exhibition this year, in which there was a collection of paintings, many of the highest excellence. Of these we may commemorate as above the average, Mr. H. B. Roberts' "*Village Apothecary*" and "*Village Barber*," both of which show an appreciation of fun and drollery, which was readily accepted by those who had the pleasure of seeing them, the former of the two being, on the whole, the best. In something of the same spirit Mr. J. D. Linton has exhibited two pictures, one entitled "*The Intercepted Letter*," the other a scene between two lovers. The latter is decidedly good, albeit a little formal: it tells, and tells capitally, the old tale of a somewhat stiff papa who gets hold of a letter which was never meant to fall into his hands. Many other excellent pictures there were which will be pleasantly remembered by those who had the opportunity of visiting and studying well the whole collection. Our space allows us only to mention Mr. Shalder's admirable landscape, "*The South Downs near Midhurst*," his noble drawings of the "*Sunset from the Downs near Beachy Head*" and of "*Willingdon Hill, Sussex*," and Mr. Hine's "*Cliffs at Holywell, Eastbourne*," and his "*Fish-market, Eastbourne*."

Another exhibition of the same class of objects—it is difficult now to keep clearly before the mind the distinction between these various shows—was that termed the "*General Exhibition of Water-Colour Drawings*," which took place early in the year. Whether or not this assemblage of pictures was due to a revolt among water-colour artists against the older-established exhibitions, we do not know, not having been admitted to the secret; the result, however, to the

public at large, was decidedly advantageous, in that they got a chance of seeing a great many excellent works which it is exceedingly probable they would not else have seen. Thus Mr. E. M. Ward gave us a capital picture called "The Votary," a girl bringing a white dove to an altar, a drawing full of grace and feeling. We rejoice, too, in two pictures with Italian subjects by Mr. J. C. Moore and Mr. Holman Hunt respectively, the one entitled "The Tiber, Three Miles from Rome," the other, "Il Ponte Vecchio, Florence." The latter exhibits the power we have so long admired in Mr. Hunt without the constraint his pre-Raffaellite tendencies so long placed him under. The former is clear and beautiful in execution. Mr. Edin's "October morning, Streatley" is probably a correct representation of what the artist himself witnessed, and as such has its merits. We think, however, that Mr. Edin is capable of better things than this. Mr. Lobley's "Toeing the Mark" belongs to the order of painted "things humorous," and as such is admirable. It is a ragged-school, with a master, a piece of chalk, and a straight line drawn thereby. Fun and character mark well each individual youngster, nor do we think that Webster could have better rendered the story. Mr. J. W. Oakes "Lynn-y-Coed" will be recognized as an admirable landscape by many a pedestrian traveller, as will also the singularly exact portraiture of the remarkable headland by Mr. G. Bowles called "Beachy Head from the Fallen Lands." Mr. C. P. Slocombe's picture of "The King's Pictures," representing two old Puritans looking at King Charles's Windsor collection ere its unfortunate dispersion, is an excellent and amusing painting; as is also, we think, a work by that accomplished young artist, Mr. W. F. Yeames, called "Exorcising:"

Towards the close of the year was opened what is so far rightly called "The Winter Exhibition," a collection always good and worth examining, and certainly not the less so on this than on former occasions. We cannot, however, do more here than indicate what struck us as among its best pictures, not, however, with the view of affirming that two hasty visits fit us to act as art-critics upon it. Thus we commend Mr. F. F. Dicksie's "Taming of the Shrew" as exhibiting powers needing little more than adequate training; Mr. Dawson's picture of "Boys of the Training-school Practising with the Sails on Board the old St. Vincent," a drawing which will go home to the heart of every one who has had the old manly training in boats of various dimensions and characters; two further pictures by the same artist, "Harbour Scene, Evening," and "A 2000-ton Merchantman," both in their respective ways thoroughly well worked out; and we also gladly notice a very clever production of Mr. Orchardson, "The Sick Chamber," not omitting two pictures by Mr. J. Mavis (an artist whose name we are ashamed to say we did not previously know) entitled "The Young Mother" and "Infancy." Many other noteworthy works there were, but our space forbids our describing them.

The "French Gallery" is one of those collections which we have now, for several years, looked forward to as one of the treats of the season; and sure we are that those who visited the exhibition of 1868 will not deem the contribution for this year in any way second or inferior to those, which have gladdened all educated minds during previous seasons. As before, M. Meissonier comes before us with more than one picture-exhibiting his peculiar talent in the treatment of objects very different in character, but agreeing in one element at least, their exquisite tenderness and minuteness. Of these we may single out, not because they are really superior to other works of his, "The Balcony of the Chateau,"

a remarkable instance of technical skill in the rendering of intense sunlight; a picture which, if we mistake not, we have already seen at the Paris Exhibition, called "The Stirrup Cup," a drawing simple enough so far as the actual subject is concerned, but not, for that reason, either tame or inexpressive; and "The First Visit," a most spirited sketch in water-colours, and deserving of still higher commendation from the material in which it is executed. "A Roman Dance," by M. Alma Tadema, is an excellent conception of the solemn character of Roman dancing, with singular judgment as to the use and appropriation of the most fitting colours. We should like, on a future occasion, to see more specimens of M. Tadema's skill, as he is evidently one of the few who, in their attempt to render an ancient scene, have given full study to the acquisition of all the necessary accessories. How many a modern picture has been ruined in the eyes of well-instructed observers by anachronisms in such minor matters as the details of dress, &c., which the painter has not, previously to his painting, set himself to learn? M. Lambinet's "Road by the Sea" exhibits a very pretty view of a small bay girt in by low cliffs, excellently drawn and very pleasant to gaze on; while Mr. T. Rousseau's "View in the Forest of Agriemont" shows how well what was at one time deemed to be a purely English style of painting, with purely English subjects, has been caught up and followed out by our clever neighbours across the Channel. No less happy is, in our judgment, M. Aubert's "Feeding the Swan," M. M. A. Stevens's "Summer," and M. M. A. Weber's "Carting the Hay." Mdme. H. Browne contributes "A Young Rhodian Girl," and M. Schreyer "Cossacks in the Snow," pictures widely diverse in subject, character, and treatment, but solid and real works.

The Architectural Exhibition for this year has shown a marked improvement over those of recent years, due we hear, and readily believe, to the zeal and energy infused into it by that munificent promoter of every good and useful work, Mr. Alexander Beresford Hope. As might be expected, a considerable number of the drawings are designs for new churches, some in styles which even the designer would find it difficult to describe. Many, however, are excellent. We confess we should like to see a new style invented, but, should that not be possible in an age of novels and railways, not forgetting of the statues and lions which adorn (!) Trafalgar Square, let our architects copy correctly some one well-defined and recognized style, and give up the lazy modern plan of taking columns from one, traceries from another, possible windows and mouldings from a third. Of the designs exhibited, we apprehend that M. Lemaire's drawings for a future (Roman) Catholic Church far surpasses those of any English artists; next to him, we should place Mr. Street's "Interior view of the Church of St. John, Torquay," M. Normand's drawings for the Pompeian House of Prince Napoleon, and Mr. T. R. Smith's for a new Church at Great Yarmouth.

Besides the above, which may be best termed the *Annual Art Exhibitions* (there were others we have not space to notice here), the Great Exhibition at Leeds claims from us a brief and passing description, though we can hardly do more here than mention a few of the great pictures collected there, and, for several months, exhibited to large numbers of people. The idea which led to the Leeds Exhibition was distinct from that which has governed all the previous Exhibitions, and which must also govern most of those we may hereafter have. The Leeds Exhibition had for its end a great charity. An enormous Infirmary had been built for the town by Mr. Gilbert Scott, the site being no less than 430 by 250 feet, and it was wisely conceived that, ere this space and the buildings on

them were handed over to the Infirmary Committee, the vacant rooms might be filled with works of Art, a Prince of royal blood, perchance, persuaded to open the building, and the money taken at the door set aside towards the expense of the working of the future infirmary. All this was successfully brought about. The buildings, in Scott's best style, suited well the objects that were grouped in them. The Prince of Wales was found ready to fulfil the behests of the good people of Yorkshire; the result being a very noble gathering of works of art, many of them but little known previously, and priceless in value. Three long wards or galleries project at equal distances from the central space; and the cloister surrounding it was given over to Edward Hailstone, Esq., who hung it most appropriately with a series of worthies assuredly no other county but Yorkshire could have produced.

Among the pictures the Italian Schools were well represented by Masaccio, Beneventi, Ghirlandajo, Della Francesca, &c. Of these one of the finest was "The Portrait of a Youth in a Red Cap," by Masaccio, and this again was followed by Mr. Fuller Maitland's magnificent Botticelli, representing the "Adoration of the Infant Christ." Then there was a noble portrait by Lippi, probably that of Lorenzo de Medici; two glorious paintings in black and white by Mantegna, the property of Colonel Markham; an excellent picture by Carpaccio, entitled "The Landing of Queen Cornaro," and the property of Mr. Layard; "The Interior of the Pantheon at Rome," showing how well Pannini succeeded as an architectural draughtsman, while the portrait of "Charles the Second of Spain," as a boy, with long white hair hanging down, shows the skill and grand style of that great but rare artist Carrreno de Miranda. "The Martyrdom of St. Andrew," by Carlo Dolci, and the "Study of a Female Figure," by Sassoferrato, are both excellent pictures. In Colonel Markham's "Baptism of Christ" we have a beautiful specimen of Tintoretto's powers; in Lord Malmesbury's "Judgment of Paris," by Giorgione, a superb instance of this painter's handling of colour; and, in Raffaele's "Three Graces," now the property of Earl Dudley, we have a picture of the highest interest as a painting, and, not the less so, if it be true that the monument of which it is a copy is still in existence at Siena. The immortal Fra Bartolomeo was well represented by his great picture entitled "St. Dominic and St. Francis meeting;" supposed by some to indicate the diverse habits and character of the monastic services: be that as it may, the treatment of both figures is admirable, and in the best style of that great artist. "A Dance of Children," belonging to the Marquess of Exeter, is one of the most remarkable pictures in the exhibition; but there is much doubt to whom the picture ought to be attributed: the catalogue gives it to Parmigiano. Among many splendid portraits, that of "Alessandro de Medici," by Titian, the property of the Queen, is one of the most striking. There were also some other noble portraits of this eminent family, as that of "Leonora di Toledo" and of "Garzia de Medici," by Bronzino, to which we willingly add, as little, if at all, inferior in excellence, Moretti's portrait of "The Earl of Surrey," and Giorgione's "Portrait of a Venetian Gentleman." But a few more, and we have done with such notice as we can give to these great Italian artists; we cannot, however, omit the "Virgin and Child," by Andrea del Sarto; another "Virgin and Child," by Fra Bartolomeo; the famous Correggio belonging to Earl Dudley, of the "Reading Magdalen," a picture which, from its numerous copies, is one of the best known, and therefore best appreciated of that painter's works; and last, by no means least

in point of workmanship, the "*Eccs Homo*" of Titian, belonging to the Duc d'Aumale.

We will now briefly mention some of the chief pictures of the German, Flemish, and Dutch Schools, and among these specially, "*The Installation of St. Thomas à Becket*," attributed, though it would seem with some doubts, to John Van Eyck. It is a fine painting, but hardly so delicate as those of Van Eyck's pictures which are most certain and best known. It belongs now to the Duke of Devonshire. A more genuine, indeed, undoubted Van Eyck, is Mr. Beresford Hope's well remembered "*Virgin and Child*." Of paintings, no doubt justly, attributed to Memline, there was a good assemblage; of Holbeins, about which there could be no doubt, comparatively few. Among the former was a very beautiful "*Virgin and Child*;" a famous triptych, whose authorship, however, has been disputed by many; and a very striking picture, called "*The Adoration of the Magi*." Other noteworthy works were a "*Virgin, Child, and Saints*," by Van Orley, the property of Her Majesty; a second famous painting, by the same artist, a "*Holy Family*," belonging to Sir John Ramsden. There is also a Cranach, entitled "*The Young Princes*," belonging to Sir John Ramsden; a very fine "*Landscape*," by Rubens, belonging to the Duke of Devonshire; and another grand picture, by the same artist, and more in his own style, called "*St. Dominic*." Mr. R. Napier contributed a fine Rembrandt, entitled "*Portrait of a Gentleman*," and also an "*Interior with Figures*," about the painter of which there is much doubt among art-critics. There was also an excellent picture by Van de Velde, called "*Stormy Weather at Sea*;" a fine Cuyp, a "*River Scene*," belonging to Mr. Harvey; and one of the best known and finest Hobbemas, called "*Landscape and Mill*," the property of the Duke of Devonshire. The "*Interior of a Church*," by Peter Neefs, senior, is an admirable painting, and so is Ruysdael's "*Haarlem Bleaching Grounds*." With this scant notice of some of its principal pictorial wonders, we are compelled to draw to a conclusion our notice of the Leeds Exhibition. We need not add that, in this branch, as in many others, it was rightly considered a great success. We hope that it may also induce to a higher style of art in more than one of our manufacturing centres.

During the past year many fine artistic collections have been secured for the nation, either by direct purchase or by the bequest of those who have had the pleasure of collecting them. Of these, that to the National Museum by the late Felix Slade, Esq., naturally demands our first attention, as he had been long known among us, as among the first, both of collectors and of judges, of the best and highest class of what is popularly termed "*Fine Art*." The collections he amassed, and which he has now by his bequest presented to the nation, are chiefly those of a superb assemblage of Venetian and other glass objects, and a noble assortment of Engravings. Perhaps we shall do this munificent donor the highest honour by transcribing here the words of the codicil to his will, dated March 25, 1868, which explains, better than any thing, his further and prospective objects and plans for the promotion of "*Fine Art*" in England. The details of some of his actual bequests we will state a little later. It was, in fact, the fourth codicil to his will. The words in which it has been drawn up are the following:—

"This is a codicil to the last will and testament of me, Felix Slade, which will is dated March 25, 1868. I give to the trustees and executors named in my said will, the sum of Forty-five Thousand Pounds sterling, free from

legacy duty, upon trust, with so much of the same sum as my said trustees and executors shall ascertain to be sufficient for the purpose, not exceeding together the sum of Thirty-five Thousand Pounds, to found and endow within two years after my decease three or more Professorships for promoting the study of the Fine Arts, to be termed Slade Professorships of Fine Arts, one of such Professorship being founded and endowed in the University of Oxford, another in the University of Cambridge, and one or more in the University of London, the amount of the sum to be expended in founding and endowing each of such professorships being in each case at the discretion of my said trustees and executors; it being also, at their discretion, whether the sums shall be equal or unequal in amount, and each of such professorships shall be founded and endowed upon such terms and under such regulations and provisions as shall be agreed upon between my said trustees and executors, and the University or College in which the same shall be founded and endowed. And also upon trust out of the same Forty-five Thousand Pounds, to found and endow, within two years after my decease, six exhibitions or scholarships, each to be of Fifty Pounds per annum in amount, and to be in connexion with University College, London, and to be given to students in the Fine Arts under nineteen years of age for proficiency in drawing, painting, or sculpture, and to be held by each student to whom an exhibition or a scholarship shall be so given for not more than three years, and the same exhibitions or scholarships shall be founded or endowed upon such other terms, and such and such other provisions and regulations as shall be agreed upon between my said trustees and executors, and the governing body of University College, London. And, upon further trust, in case, after providing for the several trusts and purposes aforesaid, or such of them as can or shall be effected within the period of two years after my decease, there shall be any surplus of the sum of Forty-five Thousand Pounds hereby bequeathed, that my said Trustees and executors shall, within five years after my decease, apply and dispose of the same surplus in such manner as they shall think fit for the encouragement, benefit, and advancement of the Fine Arts in England. And every part of such surplus which shall not be so supplied shall fall into my residuary personal estate. And the trust and discretion hereby reposed in and given to my said trustees and executors may be respectively performed and exercised by the trustees or trustee for the time being of my said will. I have made the aforesaid disposition of the sum of Forty-five Thousand Pounds hereby given from a sincere wish, and in the hope, thereby to confer a benefit on society."

The codicil itself bears date March 25, 1868. It is difficult to estimate too highly a bequest of such a nature as this of Mr. Slade's, coming as it does at a time when a certain species of Art is, no doubt, abundant enough, but such Art as those most competent to judge or to speak on such subjects maintain is no Art at all, in the best sense of the word, but rather a meretricious pandering to the popular tastes of the day. Nor could such a ruinous system be, we believe, averted by any better means than such as Mr. Slade's large fortune has enabled him to carry out.

The establishment of three Professors at three great sites of learning may, we hope, lead to the production of lectures and of competent authoritative teaching on matters of Art, which, by slow degrees doubtless, yet not the less surely, may leaven the lump of ignorance which has been for too many years the besetting sin of the English artist. Again, the exhibitions and scholarships we may hope will soon bring the ablest young men to the fore, supplying the holders of them, as Mr.

Slade's bequest does, with material assistance in the prosecution of their studies for at least three years. It has been the fate (in England at least) of too many young men of good artistic promise to labour on for years in poverty and ignorance; more than this, to find that, after years of what was in them meritorious study, their chance of an honest livelihood depended chiefly on whether they could apply their talents in drawing to the decorations of a gin-palace, with ornamentation taken—generally at the will of the setter-up of this den of infamy—from Nineveh or Athens; or, if they had better luck than this, to the architectural beautification of some new Oxford-street, in which any thing was adopted which looked pretty at the moment, with entire disregard, we say not of the needful comforts of the dwellers in the edifices so erected, as these are habitually disregarded, but of every known or as yet accepted style of building. More than this, we trust that the existence of such scholarships may be an inducement to some at present in a higher social position to take up Art as a profession, and not to imagine, as has been the habit of recent years, the fault no doubt, in many cases, of the younger students, who have been apt, in dress especially, to bring a public discredit on their public studies, that the pursuit of Art—as Art—is any thing but the noblest which God has permitted the human intellect to pursue, and the way to the highest expression of the intentions of Him who looked upon His own creation, and “behold it was very good.”

One only slight regret we feel in recording Mr. Slade's beneficence, and it is this, that in doing so much for male students he has not distinctly noticed our female fellow-workers, not that for a moment we doubt that had this been suggested to him, there would have been a far more definite recognition of the services of these too often forgotten labourers. We make no question that in the preparation of the plan for these noble benefactions, Mr. Slade consulted other “grave and reverend signors” as to the best mode of carrying out his intentions, but we also feel assured that no suggestion was ever made to him of that other class of most industrious workers to whom his charity would have been of inestimable benefit. Knowing him as well as we had the honour of knowing him, we know further that to suggest any scheme for good was but to see that scheme adopted to the fullest. With regard to the collections so bequeathed to the country, we may remark that their extent no less than their value may be readily estimated by those who are acquainted with the British Museum, when we tell them that the glass alone occupies, at present, in its temporary resting-place, thirteen cases in what is called the Second Egyptian Room up-stairs, that it comprehends more than a thousand specimens from the earliest (possibly Phœnician origin) of glass down to the seventeenth century, and that, besides the objects in the wall-cases, there is another double and flat case in the middle of the room. The value of this collection has been roughly estimated at 8000*l.*, but there can be little doubt that had it been brought to the hammer, it would have fetched considerably more. The only other great collection in England, that of Mr. E. W. Cooke, R.A., so justly known for his marine paintings, is, we know, estimated by the owner at something like 14,000*l.* We believe this estimate is an exaggeration, as we believe also that of the Slade bequest to be below the mark. It would be hard to strike a satisfactory value of the two collections, made as they have been during the last twenty-five or more years by two rival friends and collectors. Perhaps it will be true to say that Mr. Cooke's assemblage contains the largest number of beautiful objects, while Mr. Slade's will be most highly prized by the scientific antiquary.

We will now briefly note the contents of the cases in the Museum, with some idea of their present arrangement, at the same time stating distinctly that they cannot remain where they are, and that we hope, almost against hope, that the public may some day see them in detached upright cases of their own material, arranged in the central part of the room in such a fashion that the student may be able to walk round and study all their sides as the privileged friend or visitor can now do, at least could recently do, at "The Ferns," Kensington, for many years Mr. Cooke's beautiful and hospitable residence. To begin, then, two cases are filled with what may be called ancient glass, that is, glass whose origin we do not know, but which is certainly previous to the Christian era. Among these are several specimens of the polychrome or banded vases which have been found in considerable abundance in the so-called Etruscan tombs. It is probable that such works are of Phœnician origin, but we may well be silent where we have no absolute evidence. In these cases, are also some good specimens of bowls resembling Madrepore, a type in which, as in the polychrome vases, the Museum was already rich. The iridescent colours so common on the glass we receive from excavations is present on many of these in great beauty; but this efflorescence is now known to be no test of extreme antiquity, accidents of atmosphere, such as the ammonia from stables, producing in a few years what was formerly deemed the result of undisturbed centuries. Two cases follow containing for the most part German glass. This type is by no means unknown, and the Museum had already a fair collection of representations of this style. The Slade ones, however, have the peculiar brilliancy one always notices in such specimens as have been, probably since the days when they left the furnace, preserved as cherished heirlooms in private mansions. Among these may be noticed some excellent specimens of ruby glass, and others richly engraved or etched in a fashion which would seem to be essentially German or Dutch. Several other cases contain, what is after all the feature of Mr. Slade's collection, his assemblage of glass popularly, and, in many cases rightly, attributed to Venice. Among these will be noticed the curious arrangement of parallel lines, the decorations in opaque white, filigree patterns of almost every kind, with some marvellous specimens of opalescent glass. Here, too, are abundant bowls, &c., of white glass, some adorned with gold and enamel, some again exhibiting armorial bearings whereby their dates can be ascertained. Beauty of form may be predicated as that which the Venetian workers chiefly sought to represent: the perfect clearness of modern glass they either did not care for or possibly failed to produce. In colour almost every hue may be seen, but green and blue are the most common. Three of the most remarkable are under separate glass shades, two of them said to have been originally in the Soltikoff and De-Brughe collections.

The few specimens of Oriental glass are among the most interesting in the collection. Of these the finest in many ways is a lamp made for an Emir, who died A.D. 1356, a Persian ewer and bowl, which have been gifts, and some specimens of Chinese workmanship. It is the fashion to suppose that such works are merely the handing on of a Byzantine tradition; yet it seems, to say the least, not unlikely that an Art, avowedly of Eastern origin, may have lived on in silence and obscurity till the success and consequent wealth of the Muhammedan conquerors called it again into active living existence. Lastly, in the flat case we have already alluded to will be observed many interesting specimens of ancient, or we would rather say of Classical glass.

Among these are many of Phœnician or Syrian origin, and some which would seem to be unquestionably Egyptian. Others, again, there are of the Roman period, one, indeed, an Imperial portrait, another, much shattered, but the remains of a flat glass dish richly gilt, Christian in subject, and recalling similar specimens from the Roman Catacombs. The collection of prints bequeathed to the nation is chiefly rich in etchings and engravings of all times and countries. A large number of them are duplicates of what the Museum already possessed, and, therefore, are not so valuable as a bequest as is the collection of glass. It is, however, satisfactory to know that in most cases, the Slade specimen is the finest of the two. We understand that an elaborate catalogue of Mr. Slade's collection has been long in progress, and that Mr. Slade was able himself to correct some of its last sheets but a few days before he died. We trust that this may soon become public property, though from what we hear the cost of it will exceed what most students can afford. In concluding this brief notice of the Slade collection, we ought to mention that, besides the grander objects to which we have called special attention, are a number of other curious things which are well worth preserving in the national collection. Among these are a curious set of Japanese carvings in ivory, two fine jugs of Greek earthenware, a fine tazza, once in the possession of Samuel Rogers, an ancient hand in rock-crystal, a Majolica bottle, and two vases of Samian ware.

Another large collection of prints and drawings have been recently acquired by the British Museum, chiefly from the sales of Mr. C. Palmer and of the late Sir J. C. Hippeley, for the purchase of which the Government had given a special grant of 2000*l*. Among these may be noticed—a fine specimen of Titian—"Cupid with an eagle," from Sir Thomas Lawrence's collection; "Two young men seated, one drawing," by Giorgione; a beautiful proof of "A Bacchanalian Frieze," by M. Antonio, and a portrait of "St. Jerome," by Annibal Carracci. To these should be added a selection of Braun's carbon prints, after drawings by Fra Bartolomeo, Raffaello, Michael Angelo, Leonardo da Vinci, &c.; also from some of the German school, as Cranach, Holbein, Dürer, &c.; an unique print of "St. George slaying the Dragon," by the master of the year, 1488; a very fine early impression of Müller's print of St. John, after Domenichino, and a curious early proof of Raffaello's "Madonna di San Sisto," by the same engraver. Of Dutch works there were, a fine drawing of goats' heads, by Van de Velde; an etching by Rembrandt, representing himself resting on a window-sill; a good impression of the "Treaty of Munster," by Snyderhoef, after Terburg. Of French, there were two beautiful drawings by Watteau; a proof of the "Leonidas" and "Rape of the Sabines," after David. Of English, many unique proofs of Strange's finest works, as of Guido's "Annunciation," of Carlo Dolce's "Sappho," of Titian's "Venus and Adonis," with many of Woollett's best works, and a collection of no less than 350 proofs and prints by Bartolozzi and his pupils. We may add that another invaluable collection of nearly 7000 satirical prints and caricatures, brought together during a long life by Edward Hawkins, Esq., late Keeper of the coins and medals in the British Museum, has been secured by that Institution for a very moderate sum, less indeed, we have reason to believe, than Mr. Hawkins himself laid out while making his collection. *

We cannot close our notice of Art matters for this year without alluding to a most remarkable discovery for the reproduction of old drawings and pictures, with such minute accuracy that even the microscope could hardly detect the

difference. This process appears to be the invention of a M. Braun, of Dornach, a German unquestionably by descent, but actually a French subject. The process itself is called the Carbon process, and, if we could feel any regret at the successful working out of any one of God's gifts, it would be that we cannot but feel that the extraordinary cheapness of the process will stand in the way of many a young artist who wishes to win his spurs, but who, at the same time, must not be left to starve. The Carbon process must be considered as the necessary, we may add the long wished-for, supplement to Photography. Photography had already done wonders, it had altogether stopped the drawing of minute Gothic tracery of fine lace, and every thing, indeed, that required something more than the mere artist's hand, viz. Nature herself. And yet we could not but feel that Photographic results, marvellous as they were, were not naturally enduring; nay, further, that no one could really believe in the permanence of salts of silver. To the aid, therefore, of Photography, the new discoveries have come just in time to awaken men to fresh scientific researches, by supplying them with a process which has all the appearance of durability, we may truly add, the certain permanence of the one colour, black or dark brown, made use of. And that such is the case no one need doubt, who has had the opportunity of visiting the collections made and exhibited by Messrs. Colnaghi and Messrs. Hayward and Leggett, in whose rooms any one might have seen innumerable copies of the works of all the great masters, obtainable, too, by any one who appreciates such things, at a price so small as to be within the reach of almost any student.

We can but indicate here a few of the most memorable of these reproductions, at the same time stating that we understand that besides those we have already alluded to as being by Braun's process, the rich collections of drawings by the old masters at present preserved in the British Museum, are now in course of similar reproduction; the unique Raffaele drawings at Oxford being, we hope, to be the next which will be similarly made available. At present we may note that a facsimile of Michael Angelo's original study for "Night," on the Medicean tomb at Florence, may be purchased for seven shillings and sixpence, taken, as it is, from a drawing in Italian chalk, on grey paper, and preserved in the Louvre. We may also have, for a sum equally moderate, the head of Buonarrotti, called "Zenobia," together with the reproduction of a large drawing of part of the "Last Judgment." Albert Dürer's designs naturally give abundant scope for the use of this new process. Thus we have the famous study, "Cavalier armé d'une Lance," which has been generally supposed to be a portrait of Albert von Leckenzen. Another is an equally celebrated picture, the "Crucifixion," at Basle, the details of which are so well known that we need not linger over their re-description. From Florence we may note the drawing of a young Virgin, of the early period; another from Vienna of less beautiful workmanship, of the Child, with some beautiful drawings by the pen, from the subject of "The Virgin in the Meadow," all genuine works of Raffaele. Then we have from a drawing in red chalk, obviously a study for "La Vierge à la Poisson," a picture now one of the glories of the Louvre, while other designs may be procured from Bronzino, Fra Bartolomeo, Pintorriccio, Perugino, &c., not forgetting the "Psyche bringing the Ointment," "The Transfiguration," and M. Antonio's celebrated drawing of "La Peste." Mantegna is well represented by more than one excellent design, so is also Leonardo da Vinci in "The Young Man's Profile," from the Louvre, and the

cartoon of "La Vierge, l'Enfant Jésus, et Sainte Anne," from the same famous collection. Lastly we may notice the "Young Duke of Saxony," a portrait of a boy's head, popularly assigned to Cranach.

We can scarcely close a survey of the Art for the year 1868 without some allusion to the death of a sculptor who, albeit he may not have been in the first rank even of the moderns, yet from various accidents of birth, position, &c., for many years filled a prominent place in England. The late Baron Marochetti died December 28, 1867, at the age of sixty-three, in Paris, with but short notice, and amid the universal and just regret of a very large circle of friends. Baron Marochetti was by birth a Piedmontese, and was brought up in Bosio's Studio in Paris. Of his early years we know little, and he seems to have leapt at once into fame, when he gave to his native town of Turin the famous group of "Emmanuel Philibert and his Horse," the result being immediate and ample patronage from Louis Philippe on his return to Paris, and the execution of several works for different members of the House of Orleans; as, for instance, of the equestrian statue of the "Duke of Orleans" and bas reliefs for the Arc de l'Etoile, and for the Madeleine. By the chivalrous Charles Albert he was made a Baron. After the removal of Louis Philippe, Marochetti came to England, in which country he was already not unknown, having been commissioned in 1844 to make for Glasgow a statue of "the Duke," which merited, when finished and received, just applause. In 1850, he exhibited in the Royal Academy his "Sappho," and in 1851 his "Richard" appeared in the great Exhibition, the rival of Kiss's, perhaps, more famous statue of the Amazon. In 1861, the Royal Academy elected him an Associate, a tardy honour, forsooth, when we remember how much good work he had done during his previous thirteen years' residence in England, and in 1866 R.A. Equestrian statues such as those we have mentioned—there are others, too, which we cannot here record—seem to have been the subjects most agreeable to his genius, and they were those by which he first made himself known, but there are, besides, innumerable standing figures, seated figures, heads, and busts of men and women, which issued, as fast as orders flowed in, from his prolific chisel. The result was what might have been expected, a slightness and feebleness in the execution of many of them, especially of the women. Moreover, it would seem, too, that he had never, after he became the rage, time or opportunity to complete his originally small art knowledge. It may certainly be doubted whether any of Marochetti's works are entitled to take the highest rank; but those who knew him loved him as a most friendly companion and as a true lover of his own art; a man not insensible to flattery, but at the same time, as we invariably found, a man most ready to admit the good deeds of artists who, as his rivals, not seldom spoke in harsh terms of him. We can surely feel pleasure in remembering the sculptor of "The Queen" at Glasgow, of the "Lord Herbert" at Salisbury, of the Cawnpore, Scutari, and Inkerman monuments, of the "Lord Clive" at Shrewsbury, of the "Wellington" at Strathfieldsaye, and of seated figures, such as that of the Parsee prince, "Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy." As an artist it is generally agreed that his popularity was mainly caused by the action and vitality he always gave to his figures, and though it has, doubtless, been said with some truth that his drawing and modelling were often defective, yet the life and energy he infused into his sculptures seemed to atone for many other defects.

One other artist we must allude to, though of a type as different as possible from that of Marochetti, and chiefly, too, from a remembrance of the

remarkable effect his sketches produced when they came out, and of the anxiety of every one to be the first to obtain the new one, as it appeared in the windows of the chief print-shops; we allude to John Doyle, better known—possibly only so known to thousands—by his soubriquet of H. B. Mr. Doyle's career as a comic political sketcher did not extend, if we remember right, over more than fifteen years. During this period, however, indeed, since the days of Gillray, with the possible exception of Cruikshank, there has been no satirist by the pencil worthy of any name at all. The charm of H. B. was the excellence of the humour shown in his portraits, added to the fact that he did not, as too many political satirists have been prone to do, degenerate into coarseness and vulgarity. It would be invidious to select where all are so good, but we may record, from personal recollection, the effect produced by his portrait of Brougham asking the Bishop of Exeter "Who is to be the new Chancellor?" (1834); of that of the late Lord Carlisle (then Morpeth), as "Liston," the actor; and of innumerable other sketches which were always amusing without being unkind or bitter. His sons, inheriting a good name, have inherited also much of the fun to be seen in their father's drawings, but with much greater technical skill in drawing, in which Mr. John Doyle was rather deficient.

Another man has died during the past year who filled a different place, and was long looked upon by a great part of the antiquarian world as a sort of *Mæcenas*. The ex-King Ludwig of Bavaria, to whom we allude, certainly did much for the encouragement of Art, yet, whether so much as some panegyrists have endeavoured to make out, may, we think, fairly be questioned. What Ludwig did is patent enough; what the House of Hohenzollern did for Berlin, this did Ludwig for the Bavarian capital. Large sums were expended, chiefly by his influence, upon Art, and a collection of pictures and of ancient monuments assembled in Munich, of which any city might well be proud. We are afraid we must add that the old gentleman was strangely parsimonious in his habits; that he often paid for pictures less than they would have fetched in the open market, many artists being willing to part with their work on the condition of their being exhibited for ever in public galleries. As a king, Ludwig retained the close and rigid views with regard to monarchy peculiar to the rulers of the German race, characteristically abdicating the moment his regal notions were interfered with; but over this part of his career, which was any thing but kingly, we gladly draw the veil. The friend and supporter of Thorwaldsen, and the acquirer of the *Ægina* sculptures, who thus outwitted the English antiquaries, who had been the finders of them, has claim upon our remembrance other and better than his misdoings with Lola Montes. Among his own people, especially among the middle and poorer classes, the simplicity of his manners, and his good-humoured roughness of speech, made him deservedly popular. Moreover his vices were not such as touched them, or interfered in the interest they naturally took in a king who caused a good deal of money to be spent in the decorations and constructions of the capital.

We must not omit to record that towards the close of the year the Royal Academy met for the first time in their new rooms in Burlington House, which will, we hope, be ready by April for the exhibition of 1869. We have not had the advantage of a private view of them, but, from all we hear, we have every reason to believe that the new rooms will be found thoroughly good for the purpose for which they are intended. We understand that there is to be a logical subdivision of the premises, space made for all branches of art, and rooms kept distinct for oil

and water-colour paintings, for engravings, for architectural drawings, &c., &c. Students of the Royal Academy are in future to work under the advice of Associates as visitors; the library is to be increased, and to be made available to students, not attached themselves to the Academy; further, it is to be opened every evening. With these and many other solid advantages which we hear are in store for future students, we hope that the Academy, in beginning a new phase of existence, will show year by year that its aim is real.

SCIENCE.

THE great scientific event, whereby the year 1868 will be best remembered, is, doubtless, the Eclipse of the Sun, which took place on August 17-18, and was total in many parts of the East. It is, moreover, in many respects, the most interesting eclipse which has ever been studied, owing to the greater length of its obscuration than has been observed on any previous occasion. Thus at Aden, which was not exactly within the central line of shadow, the eclipse was total for *three* minutes; at Viziadroog, on the West Coast of India, for *five* minutes and twelve seconds; at Muklut, *five* minutes, thirty-three seconds; at Masulipatam and along the East Coast of Bengal it was *five* minutes forty-nine seconds. Other things, too, concurred to make this eclipse peculiarly favourable for astronomical observations; more favourable, indeed, than we have any right to expect will occur again, perhaps for centuries. Thus the sun was as nearly as possible at its greatest distance from the earth, his angular diameter being, therefore, at a *minimum*; again, the moon was at her nearest distance from the earth, her angular diameter being, therefore, at a *maximum*: and, further, the sun himself, at the instant of total obscuration, was, as nearly as possible, in the zenith of the place of observation. The result of all this was that the moon, at the middle period of the eclipse, was about 1' 48" greater in diameter than the sun. Abundant preparations were made, as might have been expected, by the scientific bodies of Europe, and, naturally, first and foremost by the English astronomers, to obtain records as exact as possible of the appearance of the eclipse, where, as we have stated, it would be best seen, viz. in different parts of India. The results are a number of able scientific reports now before us from no less than seven English officers, forwarded from the stations to which they had been detailed for observation. What is essential in these reports we will give a little lower, down. But first, as to the plans for making these observations conceived in England.

It was fortunate for Science that the central line of the path of the shadow passed across the Indian Peninsula at stations peculiarly easy to get at. The breadth of this central line was about 140 miles, and entered India in N. Lat. 16° 35'. Another thing fortunate for Science was that, in India, the staff of observers for the great trigonometrical survey of that country has always included a number of gentlemen thoroughly well skilled in the use of the ordinary astronomical and surveying instruments. Major Tennant, R.E., was, we believe, the first, in a letter to the Secretary of the Royal Astronomical

Society, to call special attention to this eclipse, and being himself in England at the time (January 3, 1866), to obtain the aid and experience of the Astronomer Royal, of the Council of the Royal Astronomical Society, and of the Indian and Home Governments, all of whom, we are bound to add, entered readily into the spirit of Major Tennant's suggestions. The spot selected by Major Tennant for his observations was Guntoor, near the central line of shadow; and the most important object he had in view, the observation of the rose-coloured protuberances on the edge of the solar disc, were greatly aided by abundant instruments bought or lent, including spectroscopes, photographic apparatus, and a telescope mounted equatorially, but without clock-work. Mr. De la Rue also gave every facility to the sappers and others attached to the expedition of learning all necessary details, especially those relating to Astronomical Photography, at his private observatory at Cranford. Besides this expedition a second one was organized chiefly under the auspices of the Royal Society, and under the personal superintendence of Lieut. John Herschel, R.E., one of the sons of our most distinguished astronomer, Sir John Herschel. Lieut. Herschel, who had had much experience as one of the staff of the Indian Trigonometrical Survey, was originally intended to have been placed under Major Tennant. When, therefore, the second expedition was planned, it was resolved that it should be placed under his charge. He was directed to confine his observations principally to the spectrum of the rose-coloured protuberances and also of the corona, and to the examination of the light of the appendages of the sun for polarization, suitable instruments having been prepared for this purpose.

Besides these two special English expeditions, Mr. Pogson, the Government Astronomer at Madras, organized and took charge of one on his own account. The French, by the zeal of M. Le Verrier, sent one to their settlements near Cochin China. An Austrian and a German one went to Aden. Dr. Janssen with another party established themselves at Masulipatam, near the mouth of the Kistna. Another party, sent out by the Nord-Deutscher Bundesrath, went to Bijapur, while Tennant and Herschel were at Guntoor and Jamkandi respectively. On the whole, what scientific men in England and Europe chiefly desired to have thoroughly examined was the conditions of the solar spectrum. Already the recent researches of Kirchhoff, Huggins, Padre Secchi, and of others had thrown much light on the physical constitution of the sun, stars, comets, and nebulae; but it must also be remembered, that the spectrum observations are all but new since the eclipse of 1860, to study the conditions of which so many scientific men proceeded to Corunna in the well-known troop ship, the "*Himalaya*."

We will now proceed to give some account of what was really seen by the different officers to whom we have alluded; and we will take first the statement of Capt. C. T. Haigh, R.E., who, writing from Poona, Aug. 24, states that he was able to get a very fair view at Bijapur with one of the hand spectroscopes invented by Mr. Huggins. *Inter alia* he observed "the spectra of two red flames close to each other, and in their spectra two broad bright bands quite sharply defined, one rose-madder, the other light golden. These spectra were soon lost in the spectrum of the moon's edge just before emergence, which had also two well-defined bright bands (one green and one indigo), about a quarter the width of the bands in the spectra of the flames, this spectrum being again soon lost in the bright sunlight." The weather was, unfortunately cloudy, owing to the prevailing monsoon, but Capt. Haigh was still able to obtain one

or two good views. Mr. Kero Laxuman, who accompanied Capt. Haigh, speaking of the red protuberances, says, "The protuberance α appeared like a red flaming torch; width, half a minute, height about two minutes; colour, dark red; lines stretched over a less red ground. The direction not perpendicular to the edge of the moon, but making an angle of 60° with it. . . . The flame α was visible for about two minutes after the end of totality; and had there been no clouds I think it could have been seen longer." Capt. Haigh adds that the German expedition at Mulwar, eighteen miles south of Bijapur, was unsuccessful, clouds having rendered all photometric observations impracticable. Mr. Herschel's report is, as might have been expected, very clear and very full, commencing with details of the instruments employed for different purposes connected with his observations. These we are, though unwillingly, compelled to omit. Mr. Herschel's first business on returning to India was to select the driest spot he could for his place of observation, and hence was ultimately led to choose Jamkandi as the fittest place, owing to the very small amount of rain-fall there. Having determined the place where he would make his observations, Lieut. Herschel goes on to give an exceedingly interesting and detailed account of what he actually saw—a narrative, however, much too full for extraction here. Briefly, he detected the prominence noticed by the other observers, "a long finger-like projection from the (real) lower left-hand portion of the circumference;" its spectrum was, as we have mentioned in the case of Capt. Haigh, "three vivid lines, red, orange, and blue; no others, and no trace of a continuous spectrum." The day there, as at Poona, was an unlucky one, there being much cloud in the sky, and, therefore, only partial glimpses of the eclipse; but still Lieut. Herschel was able to measure the orange and the blue lines.

Lieut. Campbell, to whom Lieut. Herschel had lent some of the instruments, and who observed about two miles from him, in his report, speaks of "a remarkable horn-like protuberance of a bright red colour, situated about 210° degrees from the vertex, reckoned with reference to the actual, and not to the inverted image." Lieut. Campbell, like Lieut. Herschel, was much troubled with the cloudy weather, and only got occasional glimpses. These, however, confirm Lieut. Herschel's statement in all things material. He makes the following interesting remarks:—

"During the totality several stars and planets were seen by those who were with me; and a fowl I had placed near me, out of curiosity, was observed to compose itself to sleep. It was at no time so dark as I had expected; after the total phase had commenced I read the chronometer, and wrote notes in pencil without difficulty, and the light of a bull's-eye lantern, when thrown on my paper, appeared somewhat dull. . . . I was too much occupied in watching the position of the sun, so as not to lose an instant of the precious intervals of clearness, to see much of the general effect. I had no opportunity of using the hand spectroscope. There was no one in my neighbourhood, except those of my own party who had been warned to keep silence, but when totality commenced, a wailing shout was heard in the distance, apparently rising all round us, which was succeeded after a few seconds by silence. The distant features of the landscape disappeared, and I noticed one light (apparently a village fire) some miles distant."

Capt. Perrin of the "Carnatic," whose ship was about twenty miles north of the track of the total phase, thus describes what he saw at the time of the greatest obscuration, "That portion of the sun remaining uneclipsed con-

sisted of a narrow streak (in shape like a crescent) of its upper left limb, in size about one-sixteenth part of its diameter. The light emitted from this was of a very peculiar description and difficult to describe, being at the same time extremely brilliant, and yet most remarkably pale. The high sea running appeared like huge waves of liquid lead, and the ghastly paleness of the light thrown upon it and all around revealed a scene which, for its weird-like effect, it would be as impossible to depict as it is to describe." The slender crescent seen by Capt. Perrin showed in the spectroscope several dark lines, as was to be expected.

Captains Rennoldson and H. W. King (the former the Commander) made observations of the eclipse on board the "Rangoon." Capt. Rennoldson writes, "In observing with the spectroscope, I saw what none of the others could see with their glasses, viz. two prominences on the right limb of the moon (showing in the spectroscope to the left) of a yellow flame colour, immediately opposite the red ones, the whole forming a square with the moon in the centre showing out like a mass of rock. The colour of the corona as seen through the prism was red, a yellowish green, blue, and violet; the violet brightest till the middle of the eclipse, when the red became lumpy and showed brighter. . . . The motion of the ship was so great that it was impossible to get minuter observations; so much haze and flying cloud, only Venus and one other star could be seen." Capt. King confirms the above in all essential particulars, and states that "the weather was cloudy throughout, but the clouds were thin, so much so as to allow two or three stars to be seen during the time of totality. The corona exhibited itself quite suddenly on the instant of first totality. It presented the appearance of golden-yellow brightness of no very intense brilliancy. It disappeared as suddenly as it appeared on the first sign of the retiring sun. The flames or prominences became visible simultaneously with the corona."

From the foreign, especially from the French observers, we have received as yet no special details.

The past year has been peculiarly rich in scientific papers and in investigations of the highest class, to some of which we shall now refer. Professor John Phillips, the veteran geologist, who, every one is glad to know, is comfortably settled in a good house in Oxford, has contributed to the Royal Society a very interesting notice of "Parts of the Surface of the Moon illustrated by drawings" made by him. In this memoir he states that his first observations of the moon were made with Lord Rosse's noble telescope in 1852. This great instrument, though so valuable for other astronomical purposes, was not found to answer so well when the object was to make drawings from it. He next tried, with a small fine telescope of Cooke's, which had only one-sixtieth of the illuminating power of Lord Rosse's, and, subsequently, with a still larger glass by the same maker. Both these succeeded tolerably well. But his best work was done after he was settled at Oxford, and was able to set up another and more powerful instrument by Mr. Cooke. With this he noticed the following facts:—That the shadows thrown from objects in the moon have exactly the same character as those observable on the earth. At the boundary of light and shade, on a broad, grey, level tract, is a penumbral space, about nine miles broad, worthy of special attention while endeavouring to trace the minute ridges (of gravel?) or smooth banks (of sand?) which make some of these surfaces resemble the postglacial plains of North Germany. The different parts of the moon's surface reflect light very unequally, and the light reflected seems to be of different tints. The surface is

hardly any where really smooth, such as the bed of a broad sea on our own globe. By watching carefully the curved penumbral boundary of light and shade, small monticules appear and disappear in almost every part, while in the so-called *maria* minute angular cup-craters, about half a mile across, are frequent. The area of the great crater, called Gassendi, reminded Professor Phillips of the volcanic region of Auvergne, while the volcanic system of Vesuvius exhibits, in all respects except magnitude, a striking analogy with other parts of the moon's surface. It is further clear that great changes have been caused by internal pressure at some early period of the moon's history, for there are many sharply cut fissures, like the great faults in our earthly strata, for some five, ten, twenty, and even sixty miles, but no marks of symmetrical stratification have as yet been detected, though the surface is as rough and irregularly broken as that of the Alps or Pyrenees. In conclusion Professor Phillips seems to doubt the evidence sometimes adduced for supposing the former existence of seas in the moon.

The continuation of a remarkable paper by Sir Frederick Pollock, "On the Mysteries of Numbers alluded to by Fermat," has great interest when we remember that the writer was the first mathematician of his day at Cambridge, having been Senior Wrangler there in 1806, *sixty-two* years ago, and that since that time he has risen and held various high appointments as a lawyer, having only recently retired from the position of Lord Chief Baron, which he had occupied greatly to the satisfaction of the Bar for many years.

The great progress made in the invention of guns has led to a corresponding study of the forms best adapted to pass through the air with the least resistance. We should, therefore, expect to find that the study of the laws connected with this important subject would have attracted the attention of many eminent mathematicians during the past year. Accordingly, we find the Rev. Mr. Bashforth, Professor of Applied Mathematics at Woolwich, and Mr. J. E. Longridge, giving the results of experiments made for the purpose of testing the resistance of air to elongated projectiles, having variously formed heads. In Mr. Bashforth's experiments it was generally found that hollow shot gave far better results than solid ones, probably because, as is clearly shown by that able mathematician, when a charge of 5lb. was used, the lighter shot had a greater initial velocity, and hence a higher angular velocity. M. Helié, in his "*Traité de Ballistique*," 1865, adopted for elongated projectiles a law for the resistance of the air, which varied as the velocity cubed. Mr. Bashforth agreed with the French philosopher in adopting the same law for the resistance of the air, but, following a method of experimentation independent of his, arrived, as was probable, at different numerical results. Mr. Longridge's views are expressed in language too purely mathematical for exposition in a work addressed to ordinary readers. He makes, however, one suggestion which will be intelligible enough to non-mathematical students, and which is deserving of attention. It has been found by experiment that when the velocity of a projectile has attained 1100 feet per second, the resistance of the air which is developed is far greater than would naturally have been expected. Mr. Longridge suggests that, as a wave-impulse cannot be propagated at a greater rate than 1100 feet per second, a considerable condensation of air must take place in front of the projectile at all velocities exceeding this; and more than this, that the resisting force of such condensed air will increase at a still greater rate, owing to the evolution of heat which takes place during this condensation.

Mr. E. J. Reed, the chief constructor for the navy, has put forth some most important views "On the relation of form and dimensions to weight of material

in the construction of iron-clad ships," the essential point of which was the consideration of the proportion of length to breadth in a ship, and the form of her water-lines as depending on the weight of the material of which her hull is constructed; in other words, the probability, if not the certainty, that an armour-plated ship must be made of different proportions and form to those of a ship without armour; and further, that, as the extent and thickness of the armour to be carried by a ship are increased, the proportions of length to breadth should be diminished, and the water-lines increased in fulness. Hitherto the form of least resistance has been the problem which has chiefly engaged the attention of naval architects. In order clearly to indicate the purpose in view, Mr. Reed considered the hypothetical cases of a longer and a shorter ship, both of which are prismatic in a vertical sense. The length of the long ship is seven times its breadth, and its horizontal sections consist of two triangles set base to base; the length of the short ship is five times its breadth, the middle portion being parallel for two-fifths of the length, and the ends being wedge-shaped. The result obtained by adopting the proportions and form of the shorter ship was, that a vessel of the required scantlings and speed can be obtained on a length of 342 feet, and a breadth of sixty-eight and a half feet; whereas if the proportions of the long ship are adopted, this ship, with no additional advantages whatever, would require to be 581 feet long and eighty-three broad, the steam-power in both cases being as nearly as possible the same. The general result of these investigations goes to show that the theoretical best form of ship being taken, and the most exact rule being applied in the calculations, the speed of fourteen knots can be obtained in the short type of ship, at much less cost too than the long type requires.

Captain Evans, R.N., F.R.S., has shown some curious magnetic results from observations made on board of the "Northumberland," an armour-plated ship which has been recently built at Millwall. Some of them are the following:—1. That the polar force at each compass having been originally directed to the part of the ship which was south in building, was diminished while she lay in the Victoria Docks, with a decided tendency to return to its original value at Sheerness; and further, that a large force to starboard was developed by the position of the ship for the lengthened period she subsequently lay in dock at Devonport. 2. That the greater part of the polar magnetism was caused by the sub-permanent magnetism of the *whole mass of the ship*, due to her position in building and afterwards. A curious attempt was made by Mr. Evan Hopkins to "depolarize" the "Northumberland," but her Captain states that this "depolarizing," or "demagnetizing" process was imperfect and transient, and practically productive of more evil than good.

One of the most important scientific works completed during the last year was the sending out to Australia of the "Great Melbourne Telescope." A most interesting report by the Committee, appointed by the Royal Society to carry out all the scientific details, has been made public. From this report we extract here a few *notanda*. To begin, it may interest some people to know that the telescope was constructed in Ireland, at Rathfrines, near Dublin, by the well-known mechanist, Mr. Grubb. The Committee report, that the delay in finishing this great work was chiefly due to the unfavourable weather, which not only interfered with the polishing of it, but rendered it impossible for weeks to test the figure of the specula. This difficulty was, however, at last overcome, and the conclusion the Committee came to was, that the mechanical details showed a masterpiece of engineering, the movements of the equatorial being sur-

prisingly smooth and steady, and the clock being also remarkably smooth and equable. The stability of the tube has been severely tested, and the result of its power to resist torsion was shown to be eminently successful. The optical power of the specula was perfectly satisfactory; the powers used being generally, 220, 350, and 450; and Lord Rosse, the highest authority on such matters, considering that its work was thoroughly well done. The expenses were too great for the preparing the proper photographic apparatus; but it was quite clear that the photographic power of this magnificent instrument could at any future period be most valuably used not only for the moon and planets, but also for the sun. The general public will be interested to know that the three most competent persons in the world to decide on the merits of any telescope, the Earl of Rosse, the Rev. Dr. Robinson, and Mr. De La Rue, came unanimously to the conclusion, that for the purposes intended, no finer instrument could have been made; and, more than this, that Mr. Grubb had laboured for its perfection in a spirit which showed his object was the production of the finest possible work, irrespective of and far beyond any pecuniary advantage he might obtain from his toil. The telescope was to be of the Cassegrain, instead of the Newtonian type, the chief advantage of this being that the observer is near the ground, and has to move through but a small space to command the whole sky, instead of standing on a structure nearly forty feet high, which cannot be used without fatigue and possible danger. All the difficult operations of casting and annealing were satisfactorily conducted, and the great telescope was sent out to Melbourne on July 18. We have not yet heard of its arrival; but whenever it does reach Port Philip, it will assuredly be considered "*the event*" of the year at our antipodes.

Dr. Robinson adds, in his report on this subject, that the committee selected for Melbourne a four-feet reflector, because, from the experience gained with Lord Rosse's and Mr. Lassell's telescope, they were satisfied that this aperture was sufficient for the work proposed. They chose a reflector instead of an achromatic telescope, because it is highly improbable that an achromatic could ever be made to equal the four-feet reflector in power, even at a fabulous price. The metallic speculum is known to reflect, after years of use, 0.64 of the incident light, whereas much light is necessarily lost in all achromatics, first by reflection at each of the four surfaces of its lenses, and, secondly, because no glass can be made perfectly transparent, while all glass, at the same time, absorbs light according to a law depending chiefly on its thickness. The tube was (as suggested by Sir John Herschel) constructed of metal lattice work, the specula being of the same composition as Lord Rosse's, viz. four equivalents of copper and one of tin; the *foci* of its specula were 366 and seventy-five inches respectively; its lowest power 240, and its extreme field of view 14'.3.

A very interesting series of researches has been carried out by that accomplished mathematician, Mr. C. R. Merrifield, who, late in the day, has, we rejoice to know, been appointed to the Principalship of the Royal School of Naval Architecture. His paper, entitled "On the Law of the Resistance of the Air to Rifled Projectiles," a subject to which we have already alluded, was suggested to him, chiefly by some queries addressed to him, by Lieut.-Col. H. R. Halford; the table of a series of ranges from 100 to 1100 yards, determined by very numerous experiments, forming the requisite data for his examination.

The trajectories being low, Mr. Merrifield rightly assumed that the vertical motion was determined solely by the law of gravity, the resistance of the air to

the velocity being the same as if the projectile had moved in a horizontal line. The lowest point, therefore, at which the target was struck becomes a measure of the time of flight. We can, from these data, calculate the mean velocity for every hundred yards of a long range, and thereby, of course, can calculate the resistance. The first resistance assumed was one varying as the square of the velocity; but, as this assumption did not answer, Mr. Merrifield tried next the resistance varying as the cube of the velocity, and this was found, with certain corrections, to suit the conditions of the problem exceedingly well. It is of much importance to know that Mr. Merrifield's results, derived from experiments made with small arm, confirms those by M. Helie and Professor Bashworth, to whom we have already alluded, which were made with pieces of large calibre.

An interesting series of researches "On Waves in Liquids" have been conducted by Dr. Macquorn Rankine, F.R.S., but the details are too purely mathematical for general readers. What Dr. Rankine intended to show was, that the well-known law, viz. that the speed of the advance of a wave, in which the horizontal component of the disturbance is uniform from surface to bottom, is equal to the velocity acquired by a heavy body falling through half the depth of the canal, may be extended to cases not hitherto contemplated. Mr. W. Huggins, F.R.S., to whose previous astronomical researches the world is greatly in debt, has followed out his labours during the last year by "Further Observations on the Spectra of the Sun and of some of the Fixed Stars and Nebulae, with an attempt at determining whether these bodies are moving towards or from the Earth." These researches, which were made in some degree conjointly with Dr. W. A. Miller, Treas. R.S., depended on the hypothesis, that, if the stars in question were moving towards or from the earth, their motions, compounded with that of the earth, ought to alter, to an observer on the earth, the refrangibility of the light emitted by them; and, hence, that the lines of terrestrial substances could no longer coincide in position in the spectrum with the dark lines produced by the absorption of the vapours of the same substances existing in the stars. The result clearly showed that, if the light of the star is due to the luminous vapour of sodium or of any other element, which gives rise to vibrations of a definite period—or, if the light of the star is absorbed by sodium-vapour so as to be deficient in vibrations of a definite period—the light, when it reaches the earth, will have an altered period of vibration. More than this, Mr. Huggins showed that equal velocities of separation or approach will give equal changes of wave length. Besides these researches Mr. Huggins has devoted much time to the examination "Of the Spectrum of Brorsen's Comet, 1868," and states that this comet differs remarkably from the two small comets he had examined in the much smaller relative proportion of light which forms a continuous spectrum. In Brorsen's Comet, as it now appears, the bright middle part of the nebulosity seems to have a constitution analogous, at least, to that of the nucleus, and also to be self-luminous. In the other comets, the *coma* which surrounded a distinctly marked nucleus, gave a continuous spectrum. The three comets resemble each other in this circumstance, that the light of the bright central part was emitted by the cometary matter, while the surrounding nebulosity reflected solar light. The position of the bands in this comet would seem to indicate a chemical constitution different from that of the *nebulae* which give a spectrum of bright lines.

Senor I. Brito-Capello has given to the world a valuable statement of the "Comparison of the Kew and Lisbon Magnetic Curves during the Magnetic

Storm of Feb. 20—25, 1860," showing a curious variability of the forces which were in action during the same disturbance, and the apparently variable relations between the forces at Lisbon and at Kew respectively. We must, however, state that this subject, though of much scientific interest, is too abstruse to admit of its being treated popularly.

A valuable paper has been drawn up by Mr. R. Moon, M.M., "On the impact of compressible bodies with reference to the Theory of Pressure." In this paper he supposes the collision between two rigid cylinders, whose axes are in the same right line, one of them being at rest till struck. In such a case, the same amount of motion is withdrawn from the velocity of each particle of the impinging cylinder, and exactly the same amount of motion is impressed upon every particle of the cylinder struck. In fact, if this were not the case, the cylinder would contract, which it cannot do if truly rigid. If, however, the cylinder be not rigid, a variation in the effect must occur. As before, a momentum of finite amount will be transferred from one cylinder to the other, but the mode of the collection of the motion withdrawn from the one, and the mode of the distribution of that injected into the other, will no longer be the same. The general result of Mr. Moon's researches led him to this singular but pregnant conclusion, that, in a continuous material system, in which there is neither discontinuity of motion nor discontinuity of density, all the consequences of a collision may occur, viz. the instantaneous transmission of a finite amount of momentum from one part of the system to another, provided we have discontinuity in the tendency to compression in the different parts of the system. Mr. Moon had previously determined that, when the velocity of a fluid diminishes in the direction to which the motion tends, the slower particles will offer a resistance to the motion of the faster particles, which the received theory fails to take into account.

On a subject of the highest interest, in that it affects life, we have had a very interesting inquiry by Dr. W. H. Broadbent, on the application of "Chemical Principles in Explanation of the Action of Poisons," founded upon the two following postulates:—1. That there must be some relation between the substances administered and the animal organism, on which the effects depend; and, 2. That so far as the substance is concerned, the only basis of any relations must be its chemical properties, using this term in its widest sense. From these postulates Dr. Broadbent deduces the further corollaries:—1. That the physiological and therapeutic action of the same substance must be the same in kind. 2. That the action of food, remedies, and poisons must be capable of explanation on the same principles; and, 3. That substances chemically allied must have similar physiological and therapeutic actions, at all events, that any diversity found to exist ought to be capable of explanation on chemical grounds. Now the operations which take place in the human organism fall under the following two leading divisions:—1. They may be used for the maintenance of the structure; and, 2. For evolution of force. Now the two great classes of food, organic and mineral, are in close relation. The organic foods build up the tissues; the inorganic take a subordinate place in the composition of the textures. So also, it would seem, that the organic remedies and poisons affect the evolution of force, while mineral substances, on the other hand, affect the organic processes. It is well ascertained that it is through their action on the nervous system that the powerful organic poisons destroy life. It is further certain that the source of nerve-force is oxidation, and that the seat of oxidation is the nervous

structures, a due supply of oxygen being absolutely necessary, as is clear from the common phenomena of asphyxia.

Now it is remarkable that the whole group of poisons which destroy life by powerful action contain nitrogen, and, more than this, that they all contain what is called chemical tension. Supposing, therefore, nerve action to be the result of oxidation, we get some curious analogies with the conditions which affect ordinary combustion, the conditions of which are the supply of oxygen, the character of the combustible, and the presence of products of combustion, or of bodies having a similar influence. It must be borne in mind, that in asphyxia the failure of oxygen arrests all nervous action, and, more than this, that we cannot breathe pure undiluted oxygen, probably, because the blood will only take up a certain proportion of this gas. We cannot, here, go into details; but we will take one single instance, the theory of the effect of prussic acid. Now it is certain, that when prussic acid is swallowed, this poison is carried by the blood to the nerve-centres; then, under the influence of the affinities, its elements are separated from each other, and the carbon and hydrogen, liberated in their latent condition, appropriate the oxygen destined for the evolution of nerve-force. The support, therefore, of this nerve-force is taken away. A further proof that this is not mere theory, but sound fact, is seen in the well-recognized certainty, that artificial respiration, especially with oxygen, is the great means of neutralizing the effect of the poison of prussic acid. There are, no doubt, difficulties which ever way we look at this question. But this, at least, seems to be on safe ground, that the difference of the action of poisons on different classes of animals depends on the difference of the functional activity of corresponding nerve-centres. Dr. Broadbent concludes by pointing out the following facts:—1. That the Anæsthetics affect all classes of animals alike. 2. That strychnia, which affects the spinal cord, also affects all animals in the same way; the reason for this, probably, being that the spinal system is the great centre, which is most similar in its endowments in all classes of vertebrates. 3. That poisons which have the most diverse action on different animals are such as in man act on the cerebral ganglia.

Mr. Balfour Stewart has communicated the results of some important researches into the truth or untruth of the readings of aneroid barometers under the varying conditions of time and temperature, thereby, in all important matters, confirming the conclusion we have long since come to,—that if an aneroid, correct to commence with, be used for a balloon or mountain ascent, it will be tolerably correct for a decrease of about *six* inches of pressure; and, further, that the instrument ought to be allowed to be quiescent for some time before the change of pressure is made; lastly, that, if it has been subjected to sudden changes of pressure, it ought only to be used as a differential, and not as an absolute instrument. Mr. W. Huggins, to whom we have already alluded, has given some curious notes "On the Spectrum of Comet II., 1868," in which he showed that the light of this comet when examined by the spectroscope is resolvable into three broad bright bands, and also that this cometic effect agreed exactly with the spectrum of carbon as observed and measured by him in 1864: moreover, it is well known that some comets have approached near enough to the sun for the great heat to keep carbon in a state of gas.

Simultaneously with what we must rightly call the great scientific event of

the year, the Eclipses of the Sun in August, some details of which we have already given, two papers have been written by distinguished investigators having a direct bearing on these observations of the eclipse. Of these the most important one is by Mr. S. Johnstone Stoney, "On the Physical Constitution of the Sun and Stars;" the second, also an able document, by Mr. W. Crookes, "On the Measurement of the Luminous Intensity of Light." It is obvious, that it is of the highest importance to ascertain the relative illuminating power of any two sources of light, as, for instance, of the sun, and of the brightest lamp; and that the first step towards obtaining this is to procure (or to construct) an absolutely uniform source of light. In ordinary photometry the standard used is a candle, defined by Act of Parliament (!) as a "sperm of six to the pound, burning at the rate of 120 grains per hour." The performance of such a rude test could hardly be but, what it generally was, fallacious; for candles, apparently the same, burn at very different rates, and these rates are often directly affected by changes of temperature. "It would be impossible for an observer," says Mr. Crookes, "on the Continent, ten or twenty years hence, from a written description of the sperm candle now in use, to make a standard which would bring his Photometric results into relation with those obtained here." To remedy this evil Mr. Crookes has constructed—first, a lamp which burns uniformly at the rate of 136 grains per hour; and secondly, an instrument, on plans described by Arago, Bernard, and Babinet, so far as this, that the phenomena of polarized light are made use of, but, in other respects, apparently new. By this instrument, equality of illumination is readily obtained, and, by squaring the distance between the flames and the centre, we can get their relative intensities inversely.

The paper by Mr. Johnstone Stoney, "On the Physical Constitution of the Sun and Stars," is one of the most remarkable and at the same time the most exhaustive that we have ever had the pleasure of reading. Mr. Stoney begins by stating that the true surface of the sun is the outer boundary of his enormous atmosphere; and that the chief escape of heat takes place from a concentric layer at a vast depth below the surface. Within this luminous film is a dark body, glimpses of which we occasionally see, and term sun-spots. Again, it seems likely that the central body of the sun is an opaque ocean with a highly reflecting surface, such a surface, indeed, as an untarnished white molten alloy would present. The telescope informs us that the photosphere consists of two parts, which may be distinguished, a brighter part seen in the centre of the disk, in the faculae, in smaller bright patches, and in its purest form in the brighter specks of those parts of the surface which are granulated, and a dusky part, seen towards the margin of the disks, and, in the interstices between the bright specks of the granulation. Now, as incandescent bodies radiate equally in all directions, if the light of the sun emanated from a mathematical surface, the disk would not be brightest at the centre. Hence the photosphere is a *stratum*, and not a *surface*. Again, the brighter parts cannot be at the top of this stratum, for, in that case, the margin of the sun's disk would be the brightest.

But the most curious result of modern researches into the composition of the sun and of many of the other stars, is that revealed to us by the spectroscope. By the wonderful researches conducted first by Kirchhoff, and, subsequently, by Huggins, Tyndall and others, we now know that the atmosphere of the sun must contain portions, in some cases immense quantities, of hydrogen, sodium,

magnesium, calcium, manganese, nickel, cobalt, zinc, iron, and barium, each of these elements being detected by the lines and colours shown in the spectro-scope. Thus it has been noticed that the iron lines are very numerous, and extend over a great range of the spectrum, there being, as it would appear, no bright lines in the iron spectrum to which the dark lines in the solar spectrum do not correspond. In the spectrum of the iron lines there would seem to be a continuous gradation of intensity from indigo to red. Modern chemistry shows the truth of many, if not of all the speculations suggested by the revelations of the spectro-scope. Thus, if a body of such a kind that it emits the maximum light corresponding to its temperature be gradually heated, it will first begin to glow with scarlet, orange, yellow, and green rays, and, according as its temperature rises, its spectrum will expand in both directions towards the extreme red, and still more so towards violet. If, then, a body heated in a furnace be compared with one at a much higher temperature, the spectrum of the former will every where be fainter than that of the latter, but not equally so. It may have a considerable brightness in the red and the orange rays, and show sensible light in the green, and at the same time appear, in the comparison, absolutely black at different refrangibilities.

Again, as the sun's surface is all the time being carried round by its rotation from east to west, a strong westerly direction will be imparted to any descending currents which reach the photosphere at the Equator; hence, there will be a south-east wind in the northern, and a north-east wind in the southern. Indeed, the influence of the winds in determining currents in the photosphere over which they sweep is probably so predominant, that both between and beyond the belt of spots they are able to determine the currents in the photosphere, those of middle latitudes being accordingly currents towards the east, while the equatorial and polar currents set in the opposite direction. Such currents would evidently conspire with the winds that blow over them to produce agitations in the photosphere. Mr. Stoney considers it no longer a mystery why solitary stars are either of a white, a red, or of an orange tinge. In all those cases in which the dilatation of the central parts by heat is so proportioned to the mass of the star as to render the force of gravity on the outer atmosphere the same as it is upon the sun, the star will be equally white. The class of more brilliantly white stars, with an almost violet gleam, such as *Syrus* and of *Lyræ*, are those with masses too great in proportion to their temperatures for this adjustment. On the other hand, those whose masses fall short of what the foregoing condition assigns; or, on the other side, whose temperatures are in excess, will, in proportion as they deviate from its fulfilment, have spectra more or less closed in upon that part in which the spectra of two incandescent bodies differ least in brightness when the luminous bodies are at nearly, but not quite, the same temperature,—that is, upon the green, yellow, orange, and red rays, uniting into a tint which always inclines to either yellow, orange, scarlet, or crimson. The minute crimson stars which are met with here and there in the sky, seem to be either very small stars, or else stars enormously distended by heat. But it is impossible within our limits, to give any thing like a full examination to Mr. Stoney's remarkable paper, which must be read and digested by every one who is anxious to pursue the refined researches of modern astronomy.

Mr. Tyndall has put forth some curious researches "On a New Series of Chemical Reactions produced by Light," in which he subjected the vapours

of volatile liquids to the action of concentrated sunlight, or to the concentrated beam of the electric light, with some very interesting results. One of these, which is likely in such skilful hands as those of Professor Tyndall to be turned to very good account, is the proof that a liquid and its vapour absorb the same rays. Another is the development of colour in such a way as to offer some explanation of the blue colour of our sky. As his statement is most curious, we will give here the Professor's own words:—"But the development of colour in the attenuated nitrite of amyl vapour, though admitting of the same explanation, is doubtless more similar to what takes place in our atmosphere. The blue, moreover, is purer and more sky-like than that obtained from Brücke's turbid medium. There could scarcely be a more impressive illustration of Newton's mode of regarding the generation of the colour of the firmament than that here exhibited, for never, even in the skies of the Alps, have I seen a richer or a purer blue than that attainable by a suitable disposition of the light falling upon the precipitated vapour. May not the aqueous moisture of our atmosphere act in a similar manner? and may we not fairly refer to liquid particles of infinitesimal size the hues observed by Principal Forbes over the safety valve of a locomotive, and so skilfully connected by him with the colours of the sky?"

Mr. W. Ritter v. Haidinger has drawn up a remarkably clear and able report "On the Phenomena of Light, Heat, and Sound accompanying the fall of Meteorites," from which the following result as to the character and composition of these strange bodies may be deduced. On the arrival of meteorites on our earth:—1. Single or agglomerated fragments, in their cosmical course, come in contact with our globe. 2. These fragments are arrested by atmospheric air. 3. Pressure in their progress through atmospheric air elicits light and heat; rotation then ensues, and a melted crust is formed. 4. The white-hot compressed air is spread out in the form of a fire-ball, is closed up behind, and encloses the fragment or fragments, and a vacuum-space. 5. The cosmic course is at an end when the fragment or fragments have been arrested by air. 6. Light and heat are no longer generated; the vacuum-ball will collapse with a loud report, or several reports following each other. 7. The cosmic cold within the aerolite assists in reducing the heat of the melted crust. 8. The meteorite falls down upon the earth like any other ponderous body.

THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION, under the Presidency of Dr. J. D. HOOKER, Director of the Royal Gardens at Kew, himself a Norfolk man, held their annual meeting at Norwich in the third week of August. And a most successful one it proved, much more so than many would have anticipated from the place of meeting—the capital of an almost wholly rural district, with neither mines nor manufactures of great note to support it, and which could hardly, therefore, have been expected to prove so excellent a meeting-place as it turned out to be. Doubtless much was due to the spirit in which the local committee did their work, something possibly to the pride of Norfolk men in the distinguished President of the year, and something to the quaint old town, which, with its Cathedral and a hundred other towers and spires clustering around it, is the joy of every inhabitant of Norfolk. Dr. Hooker, in his address, declined to make it, what has been attempted by some former Presidents, a complete *résumé* of the science of the previous year, but professed his intention of taking up certain individual subjects on which he himself was competent to speak, omitting others in which he did not feel himself so strong. Thus he noticed, first, as was natural, as the "Congress of Prehistoric Archaeology" was to open the

next day at Norwich under the Presidency of Sir John Lubbock, among other facts to be detailed at this Congress, the very curious one that there still exist within 300 miles of the capital of British India, a race called Khasia, in East Bengal, who erect *megalithic* structures bearing a strong resemblance to Stonehenge and Carnac. Dr. Hooker (who has been among them himself) remarks that "men," the Khasian name for "stone," is found among their villages as in those of Brittany, Cornwall, Wales, &c. Compare, for instance, in Wales, Pen-men-mawr, the hill of the big stone, while in Brittany, *men-hyr* is the *standing* stone, *dol-men* the *table-stone*, &c.

Dr. Hooker then discussed at some length the propriety of moving the Natural History Collections at the British Museum away from the Library and Art-Treasures, and pointed out that of the forty-five trustees of that institution, three only could be said to know any thing of the Zoological, Geological, Palæontological, and Botanical collections, some of which are the finest in the world; and, while on this theme, naturally discussed the next and collateral issue, the value of museums generally, and of provincial museums in particular. Of great museums he naturally singled out the British Museum, and noticed, with just pride, the indefatigable labours of Dr. Gray in the Natural History Departments; then he spoke of the Royal College of Surgeons, which attained its highest fame twenty years since under Owen and Clift, and has nowise lost this under their able successor, Mr. Flower; then, after a passing notice of the great work of Professor Heer, which proves that, in the Miocene period, forests of Austrian, American, and Asiatic trees flourished in Greenland, Spitzbergen, &c., that is, in latitudes where such trees could not now exist under any conceivable conditions or positions of land, sea, and ice, Dr. Hooker proceeded to what must be considered *the* subject of his address—the consideration of the views put forward from time to time by Mr. Darwin on the doctrine of the continuous evolution of life, and, in connexion with this, on what he has termed "Natural Selection," together with his theory of "The Origin of Species." It is well remembered what a feeling—in many minds what a painful feeling—was awakened on the publication in 1861 of Mr. Darwin's first work "On the Origin of Species." Many felt that if these views were really true, a Creator was no longer needed, and that we were drifting back over a cold and dreamy ocean of atheism. Possibly this belief was increased in many by a remembrance of the work by the writer's father, Dr. Darwin. Since then Mr. Darwin has gone on, publishing from time to time a series of what may be called *pièces justificatives*, such as his "Fertilization of Orchids," some very able papers in the Journal of the Linnæan Society, and two recent volumes of his "On Animals and Plants under Domestication." It cannot be said that, in these later researches, he has retracted any of his previous views; on the contrary, he enforces still more fully the doctrine of Pangenesis as the rationale of all the phenomena of reproduction and inheritance. To Darwin's notions, expressed in their fullest extent, Dr. Hooker gives in his adhesion, a result we might regret, did we think his exposition of their meaning clear enough to be dangerous to any ordinary readers. Is it not a strange fact that men will go on seeking for science in the Bible, quite forgetting that to make the Bible a scientific record we should need a new Revelation every twenty or thirty years? Why, Newton knew nothing of magnetism, and La Place nothing of photography, yet the Biblicists would have us believe that the early chapters of Genesis are a scientific monument! No doubt the story they narrate was enough for the people to whom it was primarily addressed, and with this, we think, people ought to

be content. Had we been so, we should have been spared the Darwins and other members of the modern Materialistic School.

The BRITISH ASSOCIATION was divided into the seven usual sections, to wit, A. Mathematical and Physical Science; B. Chemical Science; C. Geology; D. Biology, including under this general head the subdivisions of 1. Zoology and Botany, 2. Physiology; E. Geography and Ethnology; F. Economic Science and Statistics; G. Mechanical Science. In each of these sections, many excellent papers were read, to some of the best of which we shall now briefly call attention.

Section A. was opened by a learned address from its President, Professor Tyndall, in which he pointed out some of the great wonders shown during the rapid and recent development of physical science, and called especial attention to the fact that, in science, we are not yet able to get beyond molecular attraction, though this seems to explain every thing except the *actual working of the human brain*, and, therefore, that there is a limit at which the Materialist is brought to a halt, and where he is no longer entitled to say that his molecular grouping explains every thing. The problem of the connexion of body and soul is as insoluble in its modern form as it was in the pre-scientific ages. Science is mute in this matter; yet need we not grumble at this; the mystery is not without its uses. It certainly may be made a power in the human soul, and a power, too, which has feeling, not knowledge, for its base.

Mr. Glaisher and Mr. Birt brought up the reports of the "Lunar Committee," and stated that the process of mapping the surface of the moon had gone on satisfactorily during the past year, and that there were now no less than thirty-three gentlemen engaged in observing systematically certain zones in accordance with the instructions of the Committee, or in examining particular objects at its request. Able papers were also read in this section by Mr. Huggins and Padre Secchi "On the Spectral Analysis;" by Mr. L. Bing "On Actinometry;" by Mr. W. Ladd "On the further Developments of the Dynamo-Magneto-Electric Machine;" and "On the Electric Conductivity of Platinum as effected by the Process of Manufacture," by Mr. C. W. Liemans.

Professor Rankine brought up the "Report of the Committee on Tidal Observations," which was highly praised for its ability by Admiral Ommaney and others present. Its chief popular interest was in the proof it afforded of solar and lunar action on the tides; and, further, that the tendency of friction was to increase the rapidity of high and low water. Other able papers were contributed by Professor H. J. S. Smith, and by Professor Everett. An excellent report by the Rainfall Committee for the year 1867-8 was forwarded by G. J. Symons on a subject of the highest scientific, not less than economic interest, when we remember the special heat and drought of last summer, and the violent storms which, late in the autumn, have come to revive and to refresh the parched-up earth. Three very important papers in this section were those by that renowned astronomer, Padre Secchi, "On Meteorological Results obtained in the Observatory at Rome," and by Mr. C. Meldrum "On Storm Warnings in Mauritius," and "On Synoptic Weather Charts of the Indian Ocean." Those who have studied that delightful book by Admiral Maury, "The History of the Sea," will readily understand what a valuable labour for nautical science has been inaugurated by Mr. Meldrum. We are glad to see that the Hon. J. W. Strutt, the only son of an English peer who has ever attained the exalted rank of Senior Wrangler, has not allowed his steel to grow rusty, but has carried his mathematical talents to the study of one form

of electricity in a paper "On a Permanent Deflection of the Galvanometer Needle by a rapid Series of equal and opposite induced Currents;" and that another brilliant contribution to electrical science "On the Construction of a Galvanometer for the Detection of weak Electric Currents," by the well-known electrician, Mr. F. H. Varley, has been read at this meeting of the British Association. The two instruments made by Mr. Varley are models of skill and knowledge in the manipulation of very small and delicate apparatus. To Mr. G. Gladstone we owe a very interesting paper entitled "Observations on the Atmospheric Lines of the Solar Spectrum in High Latitudes." These lines would appear to be due to the presence of some substances in the earth's atmosphere, as they are always most prominent at sunrise and sunset, when a considerable tract of air has to be looked through; while, on the other hand, they are scarcely to be detected when the sun is high above the horizon.

In Section B. (Chemical) Science, many valuable papers were read, as those by Professor Tomlinson "On the Action of Nuclei in inducing Crystallization;" by Dr. Gladstone "On Refractive Equivalents and Chemical Theories;" by Mr. Spiller "On the Analysis of the Ancient Roman Mortar of the Castrum of Burgh in Suffolk;" and by Dr. Meusel and C. H. Gill "On Paraffin and its Products of Oxidation." Professor Williamson, in speaking on this paper, remarked that the beautiful wax-like substance now used in the manufacture of candles was among the most remarkable products which had been produced from coal; but what is also very curious is the chemical fact that this substance had not as yet been found fit for any thing but candles.

Dr. Meusel also contributed another paper of much chemical interest "On the Physical Properties of two Chemical Compounds." During the reading of this paper Dr. Meusel exhibited an experiment which showed the rapid change in the physical state and colour of compounds of iodine and of metallic bodies when subjected to a moderate heat. In this experiment slips of paper covered with yellow were changed to red, and from red to purple. On the slightest shaking of the paper in the air the original colour returned. Other papers were those by Mr. Guthrie "On Amyl-Ethyl-Methyl-Acetonamine," a name so long that we fear, not being chemists, we may not have transcribed it correctly; by Mr. W. Dittman "On Vapour Tensions;" by Mr. Gerstl "On different Spectra of one Chromium Salt;" by Mr. A. R. Catton "On Mitscherlich's Law of Isomorphism, and on the so-called Cases of Dimorphism."

Section C. (Geology) was, as usual, well represented, and was opened by a very able paper by the President of the Section, Mr. R. A. C. Godwin-Austen, "On the Chief Geological Features of Suffolk and Norfolk," in which he showed that, geologically as well as ethnologically, they formed one region—a portion of the North Sea Valley—the depth of which was very small. The channel parallel to the coasts of Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk is not deeper than 180 feet; a depression of this amount would lay bare the whole sea-bed from Northumberland to Jutland. Mr. Godwin-Austen was followed by a series of excellent memoirs, the principal of which were the following:—"On the Denudations of Norfolk," by the Rev. O. Fisher; "On the Glacial Structure of Norfolk and Suffolk," by Messrs. S. V. Wood and F. W. Harmer; "On the Norwich Crags and their relation to the Mammaliferous Bed," by J. E. Taylor; "On the Sequence of Deposits in Norfolk and Suffolk superior to the Red Crag," by Mr. Maw; "On the Conchoidal Fracture of Flint as seen on Flint-faced Buildings in Norwich,"

by Mr. C. B. Rose; "On the Condition of some of the Bones in Kent's Cavern," by Mr. W. Pengelly, a paper of much interest, as showing by a comparison with similarly treated bones from the Zoological Gardens, that many of them must have been crushed by hyenas. Some, which Mr. Pengelly had found, had been split open to get at the marrow; these, he thought, must have been due to man's agency. As a portion of a human upper jaw with eight teeth was also found, it is certain that man must have been there; but whether he lived with the bears, hyenas, and hippopotami, of which there were also remains, is a far wider and more doubtful question. Another very important paper, which was highly praised by Sir Charles Lyell, was that of Professor Otto Torrell, "On some New Fossils from the Longmynd Rocks of Sweden." Professor Torrell, who is celebrated as an Arctic geologist, having spent no less than four summers in Spitzbergen, exhibited several slabs, on the undersides of which were the markings of rain-drops and the trails of marine worms, which had crawled over them during the process of their formation; with them was a piece of shingle or conglomerate, which the Professor rightly deemed a portion of an old sea beach. Other papers were read by Dr. J. Low, "On the Carstone of West Norfolk," by Mr. C. B. Rose; "On the Crag at Aldeby in Norfolk;" and a very ingenious experiment "On Artificial Rocking Stones," was described by W. R. Grove, Q.C. Dr. E. Crisp also described "The Skeleton of a Fossil Whale recently found on the Eastern Coast of Suffolk;" Mr. J. Evans, "Some Cavities in the Gravel of the Little Ouse;" Mr. E. Ray Lankester, "The Oldest Beds of the Crag;" and the Rev. W. Fox, "The Skull and Bones of the Iguanodon."

Our limited space does not allow of our giving further details here of the other sectional meetings; but we may add that in each section most important and valuable papers were read before crowded audiences. We will only mention just by name a few which appeared to us specially noteworthy. Such were Mr. J. G. Jeffreys' "Last Report on Dredging among the Shetland Islands;" C. R. Markham "On the Physical Geography of the portion of Abyssinia traversed by the English Expeditionary Force;" Professor J. G. Macquorn Rankine "On a Probable Connexion between the Resistance of Ships and their Mean Depth of Immersion;" Mr. C. W. Merrifield "On the Necessity of Further Experimental Knowledge respecting the Propulsion of Ships;" Rev. F. W. Holland "On the Peninsula of Sinai, and its Geographical Bearings on the History of the Exodus;" Professor Leone Levi "On the Progress of Learned Societies Illustrative of the Advancement of Science in the United Kingdom during the Last Thirty Years;" Dr. Cleghorn "On the Distribution of the Principal Forest Trees of India;" Frank Buckland "On the Progress of Salmon Cultivation in England;" Mr. Waddington "On the Overland Route through British North America;" Dr. Richardson "On the Transmission of Light through Animal Bodies;" The Rev. Canon Girdlestone "On the Condition of the Agricultural Labourer." We may also notice papers by Mr. Whitworth (the well-known maker of rifled cannon) "On the Proper Form of Projectiles for Penetration under Water;" by Mr. W. C. Liemens, "On Puddling Iron;" by Professor Huxley "On Some Organisms which Live at the Bottom of the North Atlantic in Depths from 6000 to 15000 Feet;" by Dr. H. Jackson "On the Physiology of Language Founded on Facts Supplied by Cases of Disease of the Brain;" by Mr. E. Whymper "On Explorations in Greenland;" by Sir W. Elliot "On Sepulchra Remains in Southern India;" by Sir Edward Belcher, R.N., "On the Safety of

Merchant Ships and their Passengers;" by Mr. J. Jones "On Some Points Affecting the Economical Manufacture of Iron;" and by Professor Tennant "On the Recent Discovery of Diamonds in the Cape Colony."

In concluding this *résumé* of the Science of the year, which is necessarily more brief than we could have wished, we will only add that the great "Catalogue of Scientific Papers," planned, compiled, and executed under the superintendence of the Royal Society, has reached its second volume, and may be consulted as far as the name "Graydon." Scarcely so much as two more volumes will bring this valuable work to a conclusion. Of its use there can, we suppose, be no doubt; and, considering the number of journals, English and foreign, which it has been necessary to consult, we are surprised to find so few errors. We regret, however, that when it was determined to collect all the scientific papers published from 1800 to 1863 in the Journals and Transactions of Societies, &c., it was not at the same time determined to add to this list many interesting papers, especially on subjects connected with Natural History, which are, at present, hidden at the end of voyages and travels undertaken for scientific purposes, and often known but partially even to those who have read the travels. A little further inquiry, a few sensible queries addressed to our leading naturalists, would have brought under the notice of the editors of these volumes many valuable memoirs now in great part unknown, or, at all events, forgotten by those, whose studies are not specially directed in the course which these researches illustrate. Of the fertility of our men of science this collection is an admirable exponent. Thus there are no less than 497 distinct memoirs in print contributed by that indefatigable worker, Dr. John Edward Gray, Keeper of the Natural History in the British Museum, and written between 1824 and 1863, while we have reason to know that this marvellous list does not exhaust all his recorded labours in behalf of Natural History.

PART II.

CHRONICLE

OF REMARKABLE OCCURRENCES

IN 1868.

JANUARY.

2. SWEARING-IN OF SPECIAL CONSTABLES.—In consequence of the late Fenian alarms, a large number of persons in the metropolis and the provinces availed themselves of the permission given them by the authorities to serve as special constables, and Mr. Alderman Copeland, Mr. Alderman Wilson, and Alderman Sir Sydney Waterlow, assisted by Mr. Oke, the Chief Clerk to the Lord Mayor, were engaged for three hours at Guildhall in swearing-in and enrolling them. At the close of the day considerably more than 5000 had been enrolled to act in the city alone, including those appointed in the various wards.

The swearing-in and organization of the special constables in the city of Westminster proceeded with vigour. At the St. Martin's vestry Mr. Flowers sat and administered the oath to several hundreds of the inhabitants.

At St. Paul's, Covent-garden, Mr. Henry White and Mr. Stillwell, the county magistrates, sat for many hours administering the oath, and in all 1272 inhabitants of the district were attested, all of whom received their warrants, staves, and instructions.

At Southwark upwards of 200 persons attended before Mr. Partridge and were sworn in, among whom were 101 workmen employed by Messrs. Stevens and Sons, the extensive gas engineers, Darlington Works, Southwark-bridge-road. The members of the firm were also sworn in.

Colonel Sir F. L. Arthur and Mr. J. A. Shaw Stewart, magistrates, attended at 165, Sloane-street, and swore in a great many more special constables, including Captain Diplock and No. 1 company of the South Middlesex Rifle Volunteers, and several other officers and members of that regiment and of the 1st Middlesex Engineers.

During the whole of this and the previous day Captain W. Houston Stewart, C.B., superintendent of Chatham dockyard, assisted by one of the magistrates belonging to the Rochester division of the Kent magistracy, was occupied in swearing-in the workmen of that establishment. It was announced that 2000 of the officials and workmen of Chatham dockyard had been sworn in as special constables for the protection of the dockyard and other Government establishments at the port. Mr. Guise, the police magistrate at Chatham, was also engaged at the Chatham police-court in receiving applications from the inhabitants of the town and neighbourhood to be enrolled, a large number of whom were duly sworn in.

For some time afterwards the swearing-in of special constables went on in all parts of England where there was any apprehension of a Fenian outbreak.

4. SHOCK OF AN EARTHQUAKE.—A slight shock of earthquake was felt a few minutes after five o'clock, a.m., in the valley lying between Langport and Ham-hill. At Martock a low rumbling noise was heard, which lasted for a few seconds, and beds and windows simultaneously shook. At Tintinhull and Stoke-sub-Hamdon the shock was felt, the phenomenon at Stoke resembling something flying rapidly past the windows. At East Lambrook the houses appeared to shake, and people were awoke by the rattling of the windows and the furniture in their bedrooms. Similar noises were heard at Mucheleney and Kingsbury Episcopi, near Langport. At Seavington the postman distinctly felt the shock, the noise of which he described as resembling a train passing the house at full speed. At Compton, South Petherton, people were disturbed in their beds, and one woman was said to have fallen out of bed. The morning was fine but very cold and frosty. There was, however, no wind. A man at Tintinhull who heard the rumbling imagined that a barrel of gunpowder had exploded. This gives some idea of the nature of the shock.

14. CAPTURE OF BARRETT.—The capture of the man Barrett, so long and so earnestly looked for as the person who actually fired the powder which destroyed the wall of the Clerkenwell House of Detention in December last, and spread death and suffering among so many innocent people, was effected at Glasgow, where none of the local police who made it seemed to have thought at first of the importance of their prize. In fact, the circumstances which led to the arrest may be regarded as almost accidental. Before the Clerkenwell outrage the police had a certain sort of indefinite information as to something afoot among those suspected in Glasgow to be Fenians. After that catastrophe all the energy and astuteness of the detectives were employed in endeavouring to trace its perpetrators, and it was made pretty clear that the whole plot was laid and matured at Glasgow, and that a man named Barrett was, with one or two others, intrusted to "do the job." Private inquiries pointed to Barrett, and only to Barrett, as the

man who fired the fuse. He was seen by many witnesses, and all who had spoken of him had given a clear description, and declared that they were able to identify him instantly if they saw him again. The description given of him to the police was sent especially to Glasgow, where he had left the work he had been engaged upon, and disappeared also from the city itself.

During the night the Glasgow police were alarmed at hearing the sound of fire-arms in one of the principal streets, and on hastening thither they found two men, one or both of whom had been discharging pistols. They were taken into custody, when they gave the names of Michael Barrett and James O'Neil. The return of Barrett, and his answering the description of the Barrett said to have fired the fuse in the barrel of gunpowder at Clerkenwell, led upon consideration to the gravest suspicions against the prisoners, and a special warrant was given by Baillie Anderson for their detention while the authorities at Scotland-yard were communicated with by telegraph. This message brought down Inspector Williamson, the chief of the detectives, with four of his subordinates, and these at once recognized the prisoner from his minute description, and, perhaps, not less so from the clue they had as to his history, as to why he had left Glasgow to come to London, and why he had left London. At any rate, they were convinced he was the man they were so earnestly in search of, and on the night of the 18th they brought him and his companion, O'Neil, safely to London.

18. FENIAN ARREST.—DARING PROCLAMATION.—Another capture of a Fenian leader, Clancy, who had long been "wanted," was made in Bedford-square, Bloomsbury. He was recognized, followed, and watched by two detectives, who, at what they thought the proper time, closed with him, told him who they were, and demanded his surrender. In an instant, however, Clancy fired twice, without effect, from a revolver, and tried to fire again, but failing, ran off, and was almost immediately caught and overpowered. It was said an examination of the revolver showed that the third ball had jammed in the chamber, and so prevented the weapon being discharged.

A very daring act—though probably only a bad joke—was perpetrated in broad day in a part of the city which is usually crowded, and under the very windows of the Lord Mayor—the posting of a seditious placard on the front of the Mansion-house, and on that part of it upon which royal proclamations are always exhibited. The document was wholly in manuscript. At the head of it were the figures 1868, immediately below which was a pen-and-ink sketch of an Irish harp, surrounded with representations of shamrock, and below that again the words "God save Ireland!" On each side of these emblems were the capital letters "I. R.," denoting, it is presumed, Irish Republic. Then followed this elegant effusion, some of the words of which were sought to be emphasized by the use of capitals: "The Irishmen of America are

united ! Irishmen of England, follow their example ! Unite ; forward, ye fearless sons of Ireland ! Stand for the old country !”

In the concluding sentence a sorry attempt was made at rhyme, thus,—

“ Oh that to England nail'd Ireland should be !
 Preserve her green flag of liberty.
 Erin-go-brugh.”

The whole of this production was written upon a mean-looking slip of paper, and immediately below it another slip had been pasted, upon which were the words, in letters nearly an inch long, “ God save the Green,” which might at first sight have been taken for the familiar expression of loyalty with which all royal proclamations conclude.

A policeman who found most of the crowd ridiculing the document they were reading, immediately interfered on becoming aware of its nature, and having removed the placard took it forthwith to Colonel Fraser, the City Commissioner of Police.

22. WRECKS UPON THE GOWER COAST.—One of the most disastrous shipping catastrophes which has occurred in this district within the memory of man took place on the wild and rocky coast of the Peninsula of Gower, at the extreme end of the county of Glamorgan, and for many miles it was strewn with wreck and portions of cargo. The cause of this disaster was somewhat singular. In the evening no less than nineteen vessels, chiefly brigs, brigantines, and schooners engaged in the near continental and coasting trades, took advantage of the exceedingly fine night, and left Llanelly with the hope of beating down channel. During high tide there was but little wind, but it having been blowing half a gale from the west for several hours previously, the sea was described as running “ mountains high ” over the bar at the mouth of the Burry River. There was not sufficient water over the bar to float the vessels across, and, notwithstanding the united and strenuous exertions of the crew and the pilots, the vessels took the ground, where they were completely at the mercy of the waves, and in a short time became either partial or total wrecks, being driven high upon the opposite sands. Nineteen vessels left the port of Llanelly this night ; forty-two of the crews of these vessels were saved, and fifty-two others perished. Five or six hands were supposed to be the average crew on board the vessels which were thus wrecked. The vessels lay in all conceivable positions and state of wreck. One vessel, which left Llanelly with 140 tons of tin plates was completely imbedded in the sands, and so far settled down as to be scarcely perceptible. Other vessels were broken up most effectually.

We need scarcely say that this disastrous catastrophe created a mournful sensation throughout the entire district and in the adjacent ports of Swansea, Llanelly, and Neath, &c. Many of the unfortunate mariners belonged to the port of Llanelly and the neighbouring places, and their being wrecked within sight of their

own homes and within an hour or two after leaving, rendered it still more distressing. There was a lightship and look-out in Broughton Bay, but the sea was running so high at the time that no boat could possibly have lived had any attempted to reach the vessels.

24. TERRIFIC GALE.—The city of Edinburgh was visited by a fearful gale of wind, which continued for above six hours, doing great damage to property and causing the loss of four lives. The gale appeared to rage with the greatest fury in the New Town, and in George-street and Prince's-street the full sweep of the blast was specially felt. In every quarter of the city, slates, chimney-cans, and other missiles fell from the housetops in rapid showers, and in several cases an entire block of chimneys was blown over upon the roofs of the houses, or to the street below. The loss of life was occasioned by the fall of the chimneys of a six-story house in Duke-street, which were of unusual height, in order to carry the smoke beyond an adjoining building on a higher level. During the height of the gale, about one o'clock, they fell, plunging through five floors, until they reached the basement story. These rooms contained at the time six persons. One of them escaped injury through a bookcase falling over his desk in a slanting position. A female servant had her shoulder dislocated, and was otherwise bruised. On the other four being extricated, life was found to be extinct. Among the minor incidents of the gale may be noticed the accident to a printer, who was thrown with such violence against an iron railing that his chin was impaled on the spike, fracturing his jaw. Some damage was done to the palace of Holyrood House, where a chimney fell through the roof into a garret in the portion of the palace formerly occupied by the Queen on her visits. In the River Forth the gale, which blew from the south, raised the water very rapidly, and the ferry steamers from Granton to Burnt Island suspended their sailing for seven hours. The shipping in the roads and in Granton Harbour sustained injury in some cases, but not to any serious extent. There were, however, a number of fishing boats out, some of which were brought in by steam-tugs, and others ran in for shelter; but the next morning four boats belonging to Newhaven were missing. The trains from Perth were detained some hours by the drifting up of a cutting near Blackford, and telegraphic communication was suspended with many places owing to the posts being blown down.

The extraordinary violence of the gale on this day and on the 25th caused great injury every where, both to persons and property. The tempest reached its height between 11 a.m. and 3 p.m. on the 25th, when it raged with the fury of a hurricane. In the metropolis it was occasionally accompanied by very heavy showers, but the rain entirely ceased about noon. In the north the quantity of rain which fell was far greater, causing floods in various counties, more especially in Yorkshire and Cumberland. Even in the suburbs of London, however, considerable tracts were

inundated. At Sheffield, besides many minor casualties, a druggist named Bingham and his wife, living in Arundel-street, were both killed, the former instantaneously, by the falling of their dwelling, a very rickety old structure, ill-adapted to battle with the fury of the gale. Churches, chapels, and other public and private buildings in the same town and its surrounding districts were considerably damaged. By the heavy rain and consequent flooding of the Yorkshire and other rivers large quantities of farm stock and agricultural produce were destroyed. A little boy was blown into the River Aire, at Green Bridge, near the woollen mills of Messrs. Gott, and was drowned. At Scarborough, a working plasterer was killed by the fall of a stack of chimneys upon a house, and three or four of his fellow-workmen were severely injured. The most serious destruction of property at Hull was at the works of the British Gaslight Company. About half-past two o'clock in the afternoon of the 25th, No. 1 gasometer, a very large structure, was blown bodily over by the force of the wind, the surrounding pillars and stonework being also very much broken. The gasometer at the time contained about 250,000 feet of gas, stored for the night's consumption. The huge holder fell over upon a pile of iron pipes, and was instantly broken to pieces. Scarcely had the gas begun to escape when the whole took fire, and the flames raged for about half an hour with great intensity. In another part of the town of Hull a ropery was blown down, and three of the workmen slightly injured. The Humber was very turbulent, and the vessels in the Roads had to ride with two anchors down to prevent their driving. At Shields it was said that there had not been such a flood on the Tyne as this for ten years. From various other points along the coast news came that the gale was terrific.

25. DISTRIBUTION OF PRIZES TO THE LONDON SCOTTISH RIFLE VOLUNTEERS.—The winter inspection and presentation of prizes won by members of this corps took place in Westminster Hall. About 400 rank and file were under arms, and the hall was well filled by spectators. The honorary Colonel, Lieutenant-General Sir Hope Grant, G.C.B., was present at the inspection, the Volunteers being under the command of Major Anson, V.C. Unfortunately the Lieutenant-Colonel, Lord Elcho, who was on the Continent with Lady Elcho, was unable to attend, but he sent a telegram, which was read in the hall, expressing regret for his absence, wishing the London Scottish a prosperous new year, and stating his conviction that, if they were ever called on to do service, they would be found a reality, and no "sham." After the inspection, Sir Hope and Lady Grant, with other ladies, having taken their seats on the dais placed upon the steps at the western end of the hall, Major Anson addressed the corps, regretting the absence of Lord and Lady Elcho, and reviewing at some length the doings of the London Scottish during the past year. The effective strength of the corps on December 1, 1867, was 512, as

compared with 616 at the same date in 1866. This falling off, however, was apparent rather than real, and was due to the fact that during the year there had been a transfer of 106 members from the effective list to the list of honorary members. Most of these had done good service in the past, but being from various causes no longer able to remain efficient, they had been very properly shifted to the honorary list, though with a nominal sacrifice to the effective strength, which, in making this allowance, remained about the same as it was last year. The "efficient" in 1867 were 402, against 338 in the previous year, and of these efficient 260 earned 30s. for the corps, against 205 in 1866. This was a satisfactory test of vitality and progress, and it appeared further that the percentage of efficiency had increased from 46·39 per cent. in 1865 to 78·51 per cent. in 1867. Major Anson, then, had good reason for congratulating the corps that they, at all events, had done what they could to preserve the reality of volunteering. In answering certain criticisms, well meant, but hardly well founded, recently passed upon the value of the Volunteer force, Major Anson pointed out that the Volunteers could not have a separate organization of the Civil departments necessary for a field force. In case of invasion the Volunteers would be brigaded with the regular army, and must be served, therefore, by the existing Commissariat, Transport, and Medical Departments. If those departments were not sufficiently expansive or not properly efficient, the Volunteers were not to blame, and he strongly repudiated the notion that the Volunteer force was nothing better than a sham.

Lady Hope Grant distributed the regimental and other prizes won during the year. Private Hay, Sergeant Baillie, Sergeant Michie, Colour-Sergeant Malcolm, M.P., Private E. Ross, and Sergeant J. A. Ross were the most frequently called up. Lieutenant Scott headed the list for the subscription prizes at 500 and 600 yards, making 31 marks in five shots, and Sergeant J. A. Ross was first at 200 and 500 yards, with 32 marks. Private E. Ross was first for the "railway prizes," making 16 points in five shots at unknown distances between 200 and 300 yards. Private Hill won the chief "recruit prize;" Private Davison won a drawing-room table, presented by Messrs. Atkinson. A challenge cup, given by Lady Elcho, was won by Private E. Ross. What is called the "Celestial Cup," manufactured in China, and presented by Scotchmen resident there, to be held by the company of which any five men make the highest aggregate score in all the open competitions, was won by the F Company, who scored 955. The Lord Elcho Challenge Cup was secured by the A Company; the Hope Grant prizes by Sergeant Michie, Private E. Ross, Private Hay, and Sergeant J. A. Ross. The Wemyss Cup, given by the Earl of Wemyss, was won by Sergeant Michie. The total number of battalion prizes awarded was 105, worth 194*l.*; the value of the challenge cups won was 250*l.*, and of the company

prizes £231. Referring to the scanty show of cups, Major Anson defended the practice of taking prizes in money. Volunteers were not always rich; their expenses in qualifying as first-rate shots were considerable; and he thought the London Scottish were quite right in taking the money, which would perhaps enable them to make holiday in the far north, instead of accumulating a lot of useless plate in their cupboards. When money and cups had both been awarded, Sir Hope Grant addressed to the regiment a few words of congratulation upon their present efficiency, and of exhortation to renewed efforts on the drill-ground as well as at the butts.

FEBRUARY.

1. DISASTER AT BOW.—A furious gale which blew over London raged with the utmost violence all over the eastern suburbs, but the greatest loss of life was at the dye works of Messrs. Farman and Sons, at Old Ford, Bow, where a shaft or chimney was blown down, falling upon the roof of one of the workshops, causing the death of three women and injuring several others. The upper portion of the shaft fell completely through the roof, the brick-work scattering in the room beneath, in which many women were working, and carrying away the floor and part of the walls. Women, roofing, and flooring were all heaped together upon the basement; and when assistance was procured and the rubbish and bricks partially cleared away, three dead bodies were got out in a shockingly mutilated state, with five other women severely injured. The shaft was old, and had been twice raised to a greater height, but had not been made secure.

6. ELECTION OF A POLITICAL ECONOMY PROFESSOR AT OXFORD.—Mr. Bonamy Price was elected to the Chair of Political Economy at Oxford. Between one and two o'clock the streets of Oxford began to swarm with non-residents; and no sooner were the doors of the theatre thrown open than the polling commenced briskly. After four o'clock the polling was comparatively slack, and when the voting closed, at 8 p.m., the result was found to be the following:—

For Mr. Price	620
For Mr. Rogers	193
					<hr/>
Majority for Mr. Price	427

Among those who recorded their votes were Earl Stanhope, Earl Beauchamp, the Right Hon. J. W. Henley, M.P., Archdeacon Denison, Archdeacon Sandford, Dr. Pusey, Mr. W. H.

Gladstone, M.P., Dr. Collis (late of Bromsgrove), Mr. J. Walter, Mr. Granville Somerset, Mr. W. H. Cooke, Q.C., Professor Lonsdale, Professor Jowett, Mr. Goldwin Smith, Dr. Lowe (of Hurstpierpoint), Mr. Vaux (of the British Museum), Dr. Kynaston, Dr. Jacob, &c.

7. **FENIAN ARRESTS AND OUTRAGES.**—Several important arrests of Fenian leaders were made in Cork. Amongst them was that of a Captain Mackay, formerly of the American army, and concerned in, if not the moving spirit of, all the Fenian outrages in Cork. He was identified also as the leader in several attacks upon sundry police-stations in March last; and the police possessed evidence to show that he was the man who actually set fire to the Ballyknockane barracks in that month. Since then he had been in America, and had just returned to Cork. The police got the aid of an informer, as usual, who revealed Mackay's quarters—a public-house in a low purlieu of the city, where he was arrested after a desperate struggle, in which he made a furious resistance, wounding a policeman with a shot from his revolver. A mob attempted to rescue the prisoner, and were beaten off by a charge of bayonets. He was a young man of about twenty-two or twenty-three, and at the police-station gave his name as Marply; but began immediately after to taunt the police, and boast of what he had done to annoy and perplex them. He was very anxious to know who sold him, and cursed bitterly at the traitor; but after a while he cooled down into a vein of mild chaff.

Great excitement prevailed in Cork at his arrest. On the night of the 9th, Courtney, a detective, was dogged in Cork by two men. Suspecting their designs, he hurried on until he met two other constables, and the three awaited their approach. On reaching within a few yards, one of the two drew a revolver and discharged four barrels at the police, but without effect, although a ball whistled within half an inch of the constable's head. The police had no fire-arms, and the fellows escaped. Two men, named O'Brien and Eddy, were arrested on suspicion. Constable Horgan identified O'Brien as having fired the shot, and he was committed for trial. The same night the house of Mr. Hugo, Pope's-road, Cork, was attacked by three men, who demanded arms, and obtained a gun. On the following night a large crowd assembled at Tuckey-street police-station. In order to clear the streets, the police made several charges, and a boy was ridden down and killed. Many cuts and bruises, more or less serious, were inflicted both on the police and people.

10. **LAUNCH OF THE HERCULES.**—One of the most powerfully armed and one of the most strongly built ships ever set afloat was turned into the Thames from Chatham Dockyard. It was not properly speaking what is termed a launch. It was a floating out at high tide from a dry dock of what is at present the most powerful iron ship added to our navy, or that of any navy in the world.

The "Hercules" may be regarded as a representative vessel of what will probably soon be a numerous class. Her form and sit upon the water are as graceful as those of a China clipper, and when full-rigged she will be one of the handsomest ships in the navy, and bear comparison even with the beautiful lines of the "Warrior" and "Black Prince" themselves. In spite of all the expedition that had been used upon her, she had been just twenty months building, and another year will certainly elapse before she is fitted with her engines and ready for sea.

The dimensions of the "Hercules" are—length between the perpendiculars 325 feet, giving a length over all of about 340 feet; her extreme breadth is only fifty-nine feet. Her depth in hold is twenty-one feet, and her burden 5226 tons. Her displacement when undocked was just 5225 tons, so that she literally came to within a fraction of an inch of her calculated immersion. Her displacement when fitted for sea will be no less than 8530 tons. The screw engines, by Penn and Sons, will be 1200-horse power nominal, but capable of working up to a pressure of 7200 horses. These engines are to be the very perfection of the kind, and are expected to drive the ship at the rate of not less than fourteen knots an hour. The capacity of the cylinders is unusually large, they are jacketed all over, and the covers are cast hollow for the reception of steam. The main slides are worked by the usual link motion so successful in all Messrs. Penn's engines. Small side valves are fitted on the tops of the cylinders intended to admit steam and start the engines, whether the valves are closed or open. They can be easily worked by one man, and the engines may thus be kept slowly turning while the main links are in mid-gear. The condensers are vertical cast-iron cylinders eleven feet four inches in diameter. The condenser tubes are of copper, three-quarters of an inch in diameter, and the aggregate length is not less than twelve miles. The condensing water is driven through these miles of tubes by two Appold centrifugal pumps, drawing either from the bilge or the sea, and each discharging sixty tons of water per minute. These pumps are worked by a pair of auxiliary engines of 40-horse power. The ship has two boiler rooms, each containing four boilers. The superheaters are so arranged that the ventilation of the stokehole will be kept as complete as possible. The main steam pipes are connected to a separator in the engine-room, within which all water of condensation is deposited, and thence blown off periodically. A gridiron stop valve is placed between the engines and the boiler, by which steam may be excluded from the engines in a moment.

The armament of the "Hercules" is generally thought to be, both in weight and number of guns, insufficient for such a crowning vessel of our iron fleet. Her main deck battery amidships consists of eight 18-ton rifled guns, each throwing what is called a 500-pound shot or shell. Forward on the main deck she is to have one 300-pounder, firing through two ports as a bow chaser,

and another of the same kind for the stern. On the upper deck there are to be four $6\frac{1}{2}$ -ton guns, or 150-pounders—only ten guns in all. The Prussian iron frigate "*King William*," which is as large as the "*Hercules*," and nearly as strong, carries a battery of twenty-six 300-pounders, so arranged as that she can fight seventeen on a broadside at one time. In other words, the Prussian would throw four and a half tons of shot at one broadside against the two tons of the "*Hercules*"—a discrepancy of armament which hardly any amount of difference of armour could long withstand. But if any thing could withstand such a battering, it would certainly be the sides of the "*Hercules*." The armour consists of a deep belt, which extends from end to end of the ship, going seven feet below the water-line, and rising to the main deck. This belt at about three feet above and three feet below the water-line is nine inches thick of solid iron. From this point it tapers off to eight inches thick. All over the guns it is eight inches thick, and is tapered away in the least exposed parts, where it is hardly possible a shot could strike, to six inches. Such ponderous armour was never heard of before; but its backing is still more massive. According to the old Shocburyness maxim, the thickness of the plate is not of more vital importance than the strength of the backing which has to keep it up to its work. The backing of the plates of the "*Hercules*," then, is even greater in proportion than the plates themselves. Thus the general support of the armour consists of teak beams of about twelve inches in thickness, and this is supported by one inch and a half of iron skin plating riveted upon the frames of iron ten inches deep. The interstices between these iron frames are again filled in with teak, and the teak again closed in with an iron skin, which in turn is stiffened by a wrought-iron frame seven inches deep. In fact, if one meant to bore quietly through the ship's side at any vital part at all near the water-line, he would just have to bore through nine inches of iron, then twelve inches of teak, then through a one and a half inch iron skin, then through ten inches of iron frames filled in with teak, then through eighteen inches of teak, then through another iron skin, and last through the inner iron frames; in all, more than fifty-four inches would have to be got through, and more than eleven inches of these solid iron. Twenty years ago it would not have been thought possible by any combination of science to get such a mass to float, much less to be a beautiful-looking ship, and designed to be as fast as a Cunard mail packet.

Miss Corry, in the presence of a large number of the Admiralty officials, named the ship, and she was quietly warped out to her moorings in the river by ropes. So well was this rather difficult manœuvre performed, that she never, even in the most trifling manner, touched the side of the long dock through which she was pulled by hand capstans.

11. IRISH ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN.—A numerous deputation waited upon Mr. Gathorne Hardy, the Home Secretary, to hand to

him, for presentation to Her Majesty, an address of loyalty and affection from the Irish residents of London, evoked by the Fenian conspiracy and the Clerkenwell outrage. The address, which had appended to it 22,603 names, was a protestation of loyalty and devotion on the part of the Irish population of the metropolis generally.

— FIRE AT THE OXFORD MUSIC HALL.—A fire occurred at the Oxford Music Hall, in Oxford-street, by which a great part of the building, one of the finest of its class in London, was destroyed. About three o'clock in the morning a fireman employed to watch the premises found the stuffed seats in the corner of the gallery opposite the stage on fire, and the flames rapidly spreading through the cocoa-nut fibre with which the cushions were stuffed. About the same time the police saw smoke rising from the building, and while they were endeavouring to ascertain the cause, flames burst from the roof, showing that the fire had already spread through the whole interior of the building. The inmates of the houses adjoining the hall were at once aroused, and information of the outbreak was sent to the station of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade in Crown-street; and within a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes after receipt of the call, Captain Shaw and Mr. Bridges, the senior foreman, arrived with the engines and between forty and fifty firemen. The flames, however, had made rapid progress. In less than an hour from the time when the fire was first noticed, the greater part of the roof fell, and with it the great glass chandelier which lighted the hall. The stage and balcony boxes were then in flames, and it seemed that no part of the building would be saved from destruction. Immediately beneath the hall were cellars, in which a large quantity of wines and spirits was stored, and had the flames reached these the danger to the neighbouring buildings would have been much increased. But, although the immense roof fell on to the floor immediately over the cellars, there was no opening made into the vaults. On the arrival of the firemen fifteen steam and manual engines were at once set to work, and brought to bear on every part of the burning building. Several of the engines were conveyed up the main entrance, and made to play on the interior, in spite of the heat and smoke which nearly suffocated the firemen. After working for about three hours, however, they finally extinguished the flames. Of the roof nothing remained in position but a few charred beams. One end of the gallery was completely destroyed. Several of the colossal stone pillars which ascended from the gallery upwards were much damaged, long and deep pieces having been split from them, presumably by the falling roof. The floor was covered with a mass of glass, plaster, burnt wood, and the inflammable cocoa-nut fibre, all saturated with water. Surprise was excited at the fact that the private boxes, immediately adjoining the portion of the gallery most completely destroyed, were comparatively uninjured, the discolouration of the crimson curtains by the smoke at their entrance

being the only perceptible damage done to them, and that in recesses of the wall bottles and glasses of every description stood in many cases intact, although some were seen to have been cracked and starred in all directions by the heat. The mirrors at the back of the stage were split and cracked, and the stage itself was heaped up with the rubbish that had descended from the roof. Among it were the remains of two bass instruments, which in consequence of their size and weight had not been stored away with the other instruments on the previous night. The grand piano still stood upright, though charred and blackened, and rendered useless as a musical instrument. With the exceptions mentioned, the whole of the instruments remained uninjured, having been stored in a room not touched by the fire.

The building and its contents were insured for 16,000*l*.

— FENIAN OUTRAGE IN CORK.—Two attempts at assassination occurring on the same night sufficiently indicated the desperate spirit which animated some of the Fenian bands which infested the city of Cork, and whose favour with the populace seemed to grow in proportion to their audacity. In the night, about seven o'clock, two constables, named Kearney and Thompson, were walking down the Main-street on duty, when a pistol shot was fired at them from the opposite side, whether from a window or a corner they could not tell. A bullet struck the shutters of a shop close to Thompson's head, and became imbedded in the wood. The constables were unprovided with fire-arms, and conceived it to be useless as well as dangerous to attempt any pursuit, especially as groups of people about the lane received them with mingled derision and menace. They reported the matter at Shandon-street police-station, and a party of armed constables turned out and proceeded to the place, where a dense crowd had by that time collected, who hooted and jeered at the police. The mob was driven back, some suspicious-looking persons were searched, as were also the houses in the vicinity, but no clue was found to the perpetrator of the outrage.

About ten o'clock the population was again aroused by a report that a collision had taken place in which a "civilian" had been shot. The melancholy affair occurred under the following circumstances:—Two policemen, named Hunter and Flanagan, were patrolling the street which runs between the Butter Weigh-house and the North Infirmary, when they observed two men approaching whom they regarded with suspicion. When they came near enough to discern the uniform of the constables, they made an evasive movement towards the other side of the street, which made them the more strongly suspected. Hunter called upon the first man to stand, which he did, and Hunter, feeling his pockets, detected a revolver in the breast of his coat, and said, "Hand me out that revolver you have in your pocket." The man sprang back three or four paces, and pulled out the weapon. Hunter put his rifle to his shoulder, and threatened to shoot him if he did not

deliver it up. He made an attempt to get past the constable, but Flanagan, who was at that time engaged with the other man, prevented him. He then presented it at Flanagan, and as he fired said, "There it is for you." The constables immediately discharged their rifles, and he fell. They went forward to raise him, and the other man, seeing them engaged, effected his escape. After bringing him a little way, they saw that he required medical aid, and went to the infirmary to procure it. Having waited for a moment to give notice of the occurrence and re-load their rifles, they returned to the place where they had left the wounded man, but he was nowhere to be seen. A crowd, however, had collected, and as they approached two men were observed to detach themselves from the rest and take to flight. The police pursued and arrested them. On searching them the constables found the stock of a gun on one and a loaded barrel on the other. A patrol of police arrived about half-past twelve o'clock, who assisted in searching the houses. At one of them, situate in Dominick-street, they observed outside the door a six-chambered revolver, two barrels of which had been discharged, and the other four were still loaded. All the prisoners were brought up at the police-office, and were committed for trial.

17. VISIT OF THE PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF WALES TO ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL.—Their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, attended by Colonel Keppel and the Hon. Mrs. Grey, paid a visit to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, of which his Royal Highness is President. They were received by Mr. W. Foster White, Treasurer of the hospital, Mr. Paget, and the principal surgeons and officers of the institution, and were first conducted over the wards in which the sufferers by the explosion at Clerkenwell were confined, numbering between thirty and forty persons. Their Royal Highnesses spent a considerable time in the wards, and visited the whole of the patients, the Princess conversing with many of them, and kindly expressing her regard for their care and comfort. The unfortunate sufferers seemed deeply touched by the kindness of the royal visitors. They were subsequently conducted over that part of the hospital devoted to the out-patients, as well as the apothecaries' department and the kitchen. It was noticed that the Princess of Wales seemed in excellent spirits, and was able to walk about without fatigue. Upon leaving the hospital their Royal Highnesses expressed their acknowledgments to the Treasurer, Mr. Foster White, and the staff of medical gentlemen connected with the hospital. Hundreds of persons congregated around the entrances to the hospital during the visit, and their Royal Highnesses were heartily cheered on their arrival and departure.

18. SUICIDE AT THE CRYSTAL PALACE.—Between five and six o'clock in the afternoon, as the men employed about the palace were leaving off work, some of them heard a noise in the vicinity of a smith's workshop at the northern end of the building as if of

something which had fallen down from the tower. Two of them went forthwith to find out what had happened, and discovered the body of a young man about twenty feet from the shop door and ten or twelve feet from the northern tower. A surgeon was immediately summoned to examine the body, which he pronounced to be dead. The skull of the deceased was crushed, and several of his bones were literally smashed to pieces. The features of the face, however, were not in the slightest degree mutilated or distorted. Some silver and a cigar case were found on the deceased, as also a church service, in which his name, Thomas Lee, was found inscribed, with the date the 18th of January, 1868. It appeared that deceased had been a draper's assistant, first at an establishment in Essex-road, and secondly at another house at which a similar business was carried on in the Borough. On the 17th last he entered the service of a West-end firm as salesman. He was at the same time informed by one of the managers that it would be necessary for him to obtain a recommendation from his former employers. He referred the manager to the principals of the house in Essex-road in which he had at first served as assistant, and they, in reply to a communication addressed to them regarding the character of the deceased, stated that they had already given him a recommendation to the firm in which he had been employed in the Borough. On application being made, with a view to obtain the recommendation required, the principals of the last-mentioned establishment returned such an answer that his actual employers found it impossible to retain the deceased in their service. It appeared, as stated in evidence by one of the brothers of the deceased, that there had been two persons named Lee in the employment of the firm in the Borough to which reference had been made. One of these was the deceased, who had always been well conducted, and the other was a man of a most dissipated and irregular character. When the firm in the Borough were applied to for a recommendation of deceased, they believed the inquiry was made regarding the other person of the same name to whom we have alluded. On being compelled to leave his employment the deceased was greatly depressed, so much so that one of the principals advised him to consult with his brothers, with a view to obtain the necessary recommendation from his previous employer. He called twice at the house in the Borough in which he had formerly served as an assistant, but on both occasions the manager was out. His brothers advised him in the meantime to go down to the house of his mother, who resided in the neighbourhood of Norwood. Instead of doing so, however, he proceeded, it would appear, direct to the northern tower of the Crystal Palace, from which he precipitated himself.

The boy who was in charge of the tower deposed that deceased looked very pale and sickly when he applied for admission. Deceased must have thrown himself off the top of the tower, for it would be impossible for him to throw himself out of any of the

windows of the structure. It was stated that the distance from the gallery of the tower to the place in which deceased was found is over 200 feet.

The Coroner having summed up the evidence, of which we have given the material portions, the jury returned a verdict to the effect that deceased had committed suicide while in a state of intense mental depression. The Coroner added that he wished it to be publicly understood that the circumstance regarding the refusal of a recommendation of the deceased had arisen entirely from a misconception.

20. EXPERIMENTS WITH THE "EXTINCTEUR" ON THE THAMES EMBANKMENT.—The Prince of Wales and the Duke of Sutherland, who are known to take a particular interest in the organization and action of all means of extinguishing fires, witnessed some interesting experiments with Dick's patent portable self-acting fire-engine, named "L'Extincteur," in which carbonic acid gas—one of the most powerful non-supporters of combustion known to chemists—is the active agent. "L'Extincteur" consists of a strong metallic cylinder containing water, supersaturated with this gas, which is generated in the closed vessel by a simple contrivance. When the tube connected with the cylinder is opened, the elasticity of the confined gas projects the liquid with great force to some distance. The gas, being in this manner freed from pressure, is liberated from the water, and acts on the burning materials; and the carbonic acid, on account of its great density, is not so readily dissipated as would be the case if a lighter gas were used. The machine is of a size to be carried upon a man's back, leaving his hands quite free to manage the hose and tap. It has already come into use in many factories and warehouses in the north of England, and in the mansions of the Duke of Sutherland, the Duke of Argyll, and other noblemen; and its utility has been proved in repeated cases where a large amount of property has been saved by this means from destruction. The Prince of Wales having expressed a wish to see an experimental trial of the apparatus, Mr. James Farie, the licensee, made the necessary arrangements. A convenient place for this purpose, on the ground now occupied by the works of the Contract No. 2, for the Thames Embankment, was obtained by permission of Mr. Ritson, the contractor. On this ground, opposite the bottom of Norfolk-street, Strand, three temporary structures were put up by Mr. Stevens, the manager of the works. The first of these was a large wooden tank, filled with tar and naphtha; the second was a timber framework filled with a dozen of tar and other casks, firewood, and shavings; the third represented three sides of a carpenter's shop, the fourth side being open to windward, and this was filled with workbench, shelves, firewood, shavings, and other inflammable materials, all saturated with tar and naphtha.

At half-past twelve, the Prince came with the Duke of Sutherland and Lieutenant-Colonel Keppell. He was received by Sir

John Thwaites, Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works; Mr. E. Presby; Mr. J. W. Bazalgette, engineer to the Board; Mr. Ritson, the contractor; Mr. C. D. Ridley, C.E.; Mr. E. Cooper, C.E.; Mr. Farie, and other gentlemen. Mr. Farie gave his Royal Highness an explanation of the principle and mode of charging and using the machines. He then proceeded to set fire to the tank, and in a few moments there was a great body of fire, accompanied by dense smoke. A small-sized extingueur was brought to bear on it, and the whole mass of fire was almost instantaneously extinguished. The framework of timber and casks was then set fire to, and was allowed to be thoroughly ignited before the machine was brought to bear upon it. The wind had so increased that the flames roared like a furnace, and the opinion of all present was, that the extingueur would have hard work to master such a mass of fire. A No. 5 machine, however, being brought to bear on it, the flames were extinguished in a minute or so, but leaving a pile of red charred wood, which the strong wind repeatedly fanned into flame again. With the aid of a second No. 5, the whole was effectually extinguished within two or three minutes. Mr. Farie stated that this was the first occasion on which he had had to employ more than one machine in an experiment. The Prince then remarked that the test to which Mr. Farie had submitted the machines was a very severe one, on account of the strong draught through the pile, which would not perhaps be the case with an ordinary fire. His Royal Highness, before leaving, expressed to Mr. Farie his entire satisfaction with all that he had seen.

21. DISCOVERY OF A MISSING CLERGYMAN.—An arrest was made at Padstow, in Cornwall, of a clergyman who mysteriously disappeared about six weeks before, under circumstances which caused great anxiety among his friends and some alarm to the public. The Rev. B. Speke, the subject of the arrest, was brother of the late Captain Speke, the African explorer. He was rector of Dowlish Wake, Somersetshire, and left Ilminster station for London on the 8th of January, for the purpose of officiating at the wedding of a friend. As he never put in an appearance there the telegraph was called into requisition, and eventually the metropolitan detectives were set to work. They discovered that about 5.30 p.m. on the 8th, Mr. Speke purchased a hat in Warwick-street, but with his exit from the latter's shop all trace of the missing gentleman was lost. Advertisements in the London papers, offering 100*l.* reward, elicited no response. Mr. Speke was about thirty-five years of age, of athletic build, and well acquainted with London. He had some 20*l.* in his possession.

The only trace of the missing gentleman was the discovery, in Birdcage-walk, of his hat—not the new hat, but the one he had been wearing—by a workman. The other, which he purchased at the shop in Pimlico, was, by his direction, sent to his place of

abode. The finder of the hat, which bore some marks of rough treatment, kept possession of it for a short time and then gave it into the hands of the police.

The disappearance of Mr. Speke may be said to have occasioned an almost universal panic among the public, and the daily papers teemed with letters containing, for the most part, the wildest theories and conjectures as to its cause. That an athletic clergyman should be spirited away in the middle of London at an early hour in the evening, leaving no trace behind him, seemed incredible; while on the other hand it was just as hard to believe that a gentleman of good reputation and sound mind, according to the assurance of his friends, should voluntarily desert them without giving the slightest indications of his whereabouts to alleviate their anxiety. The latter supposition, however, proved correct, when the news came that Mr. Speke had been arrested at Padstow, in the dress of a bullock-driver, under a belief that he was a man named Ayre, whom the police "wanted" for an offence at Hull. The prisoner was soon found not to be the person supposed; but his superior bearing, the fact that he had considerable money upon him, and several disguises, led to the suspicion that he was the man upon whose disappearance so much speculation had arisen. His relatives at once went after him, and brought him to London.

It appeared, from a diary kept by Mr. Speke during his absence, that the purpose of absconding was formed immediately upon, if not antecedent to, his arrival in London, and that the same evening he went by train from Waterloo Station to Basingstoke. Thence he pursued his journey on foot to Winchester, and afterwards visited Portsmouth and Gosport. On the 29th of January he went to Plymouth, where he stopped a fortnight, making daily excursions. He was neither ignorant of nor indifferent to the anxiety that was being caused by his absence, and stated that when at Plymouth he regularly perused the *Western Morning News*, but assigned no direct reason why he would not terminate the suspense. He appeared, as far as could be gathered, to have hoped that the commotion would subside, and that then he would have quietly communicated with his friends. From Plymouth Mr. Speke finally walked to the little ports of Looe and Fowey, on the south coast, and thence to Bodmin, where he put up at the Queen's Head Inn. He then went to Padstow, fifteen miles distant, leaving his luggage, which consisted of one large portmanteau containing clothing and books, at Bodmin, saying that he would return on the 22nd and spend the following Sunday there, and would attend church. At Bodmin he appears to have figured in the disguise of a bullock-drover, and his object in visiting Padstow he stated to have been to make inquiries concerning the sailing of steamers thence for Swansea or Cardiff, and that having got thither he would walk through Wales to Liverpool, and embark there for America.

It was the opinion of the physicians who saw Mr. Speke after

his arrest, that the reverend gentleman had been suffering for a long time under a depressing form of hypochondriasis which dominated his whole mind, and it was their conviction that Mr. Speke's actions had been beyond his control.

25. FENIAN PRISONERS COMMITTED FOR TRIAL.—The seven prisoners—William and Timothy Desmond, Nicholas English, John O'Keefe, James O'Neil, Michael Barrett, and Anne Justice—who stood remanded on the charge of wilful murder of the persons killed by the Clerkenwell explosion, in December last, were placed at the bar for final examination, at Bow-street police-court, before Sir Thomas Henry, and were committed for trial at the March sessions of the Central Criminal Court.

27. PROSECUTION OF EX-GOVERNOR EYRE.—At the Bow-street police-court an important application was made to Sir Thomas Henry, the chief magistrate.

Sir R. P. Collier (with whom was Mr. J. Horne Payne), instructed by Messrs. Shaen and Roscoe, solicitors to the Jamaica Committee, on behalf of Mr. John Stuart Mill, the president, and Mr. P. A. Taylor, the secretary of the Jamaica Committee, said he had to apply for a warrant against Mr. John Edward Eyre on the charge of having been accessory before the fact to the murder of Mr. John William Gordon, at Morant Bay, Jamaica, on the 23rd of October, 1865. The application was made under two Acts of Parliament, perfectly familiar to the learned chief magistrate—the 24th and 25th of Victoria, cap. 100, and the 11th and 12th of Victoria, cap. 4. It might, perhaps, be said that, considering the date at which the events occurred, this was a late period at which to take the proceedings; but, on a former occasion, when an application was made for warrants against General Nelson and Lieutenant Brand for the murder of Mr. Gordon, it had been intended that this application should be made at the same time; but it was found that Mr. Eyre was not at that time within the jurisdiction of the court, and it would, therefore, not be competent to the magistrates here to grant any such warrant. Mr. Eyre being now within the jurisdiction that difficulty was removed, and the present proceeding had been taken as soon as the opportunity had arisen; for it was not possible to bring the matter under the notice of the learned chief magistrate before the parties were within his jurisdiction. He should only be repeating what was matter of common knowledge when he stated that an application had at that time been made to the local magistrates in Shropshire. But he should presume that Sir Thomas Henry would not be concluded by that decision, but would exercise his own discretion, and act upon his own judgment, entirely independent of what had occurred in another jurisdiction. Moreover, the decision of the justices was given before the delivery of the charge of the Lord Chief Justice in the case of General Nelson and Lieutenant Brand. That charge had since been published by the Lord Chief Justice with copious notes, giving a most luminous statement of the martial law.

It was no disparagement to the country justices to say that probably they were not at that time fully acquainted with the law on this question. If they had possessed the advantage of all the store of learning and all the weight of authority collected and disclosed in that charge, they might probably have arrived at a different decision. It was a peculiarity of the English law, and he, for one, ventured to regard it as a defect, that there was no public prosecutor—no official person charged with the duty of bringing offenders to justice. That was ordinarily left to private persons, and but that they frequently did it from a sense of public duty, many great crimes would escape without punishment or even investigation. The gentlemen by whom he was instructed were not actuated by any motive of personal interest, but acted from a painful sense of public duty. They believed that a great crime had been committed—that a British subject had been put to death without warrant, and under circumstances which made the act that which the law called murder. That they considered to be an important matter for inquiry, affecting, as it did, the tenure by which every man in the colonies, and indeed in Her Majesty's dominions, has his life and property.

Sir R. P. Collier then entered at some length into the case, and Sir Thomas Henry said, "The highest authority has laid down the law on that subject, and he has charged a jury, putting before them all the arguments which you have used, and they have thrown out the bill against the principals. The bill against the principals having been thrown out, the Grand Jury have decided, not only that the charge of murder was not established, but that there was not even a *prima facie* case to go before a jury. I am not aware of any case in which, when a bill against the principals on a charge of murder has been ignored, a magistrate has afterwards granted a warrant against an accessory. There has certainly been no such case during the twenty-eight years that I have presided as a magistrate."

Sir R. P. Collier contended that the decision of the Grand Jury was not conclusive.

Sir Thomas Henry said that the prosecution appeared to have acquiesced in it, for they had not preferred another bill against the principals.

Sir R. P. Collier said they were out of the jurisdiction of the court.

Sir Thomas Henry said he could not grant the warrant, unless he declared that the Grand Jury were wrong in their decision. The question was left to them by the Lord Chief Justice, who said, "If you think the accused ought not to be harassed by criminal proceedings, and that the case ought not to go to a jury, you will say so by ignoring the indictment." Again, "If you think that, although there may have been a mistake, and a most grievous mistake, in condemning this man and sending him to death . . . yet, if the proceedings were done honestly and faith-

fully, and in what was believed to be the due course of the administration, again I say that you ought not to harass the accused persons by sending them for trial before another tribunal." Under these circumstances, he (Sir Thomas Henry) did not feel justified in granting the warrant, but the prosecutors were not debarred from proceeding by indictment at the sessions.

The parties then left the court.

— ACCIDENT ON THE NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY.—Between two and three o'clock A.M., a collision occurred on the North British Railway, at a point near the Arniston Collieries, whereby three men were killed and a large quantity of plant destroyed. An engine with a van had been sent from Falshill for the purpose of bringing up a mineral train from the collieries. On reaching Arniston station, one of the guards left the van with the intention, it was said, of turning on the danger signal; but, before he could do so, a goods train from Newcastle came up at full speed and dashed into the engine and van. The driver and fireman of the goods train and one of the guards of the coal train were killed on the spot. The guard of the goods train and the driver and stoker of the coal train were injured, but not seriously. The engine of the goods train was thrown off the line and a large number of the waggons were destroyed. The bodies of the three unfortunate men were with difficulty extricated from the *débris*, and they were found to be in a dreadfully mutilated state. The lines were blocked up for several hours, and the passengers by the morning trains had to change carriages at the scene of the accident.

28. SIX THOUSAND PERSONS SUMMONED.—The "compound householder" difficulty was the cause of an extraordinary scene of excitement at the Town Hall, Hackney. More than 6,000 persons, occupiers of small tenements in the parish, who formerly compounded with their landlords to pay the taxes and rates, but who are now, under the new Reform Act, all assessed, were summoned before the magistrates for refusing to pay rates. Long before the hour fixed for hearing the summonses the approaches to the hall were crowded to excess, and by ten and eleven o'clock the crush became fearful. Several women were lifted out of the crowd in a fainting condition. Most of the defendants were poor hard-working women, who were paying 6s. and 7s. per week rent. In many instances the rate collectors bore testimony to the wretched condition of the persons summoned, and their being utterly unable to pay the amount of the rates; but the magistrates had no alternative but to make an order that they must be paid, a certain time being allowed them to do so.

MARCH.

2. SHOCKING MURDERS AT TODMORDEN.—One of the most atrocious murders that have been heard of in this country since, perhaps, that committed by Rush, was committed at Todmorden by a weaver of checks, named Miles Weatherill. The scene of the tragedy was the Parsonage House attached to the parish-church of Todmorden. The inmates of the Parsonage were the Rev. Mr. Plow, Mrs. Plow (scarcely convalescent after confinement), a “monthly nurse,” and three domestic servants, one of whom (the nursery-maid) went by the name of “Jane.” Between ten and eleven o’clock, Mr. Plow, who had returned late from a parochial visit, was preparing to go to bed, when he heard a violent knocking at the back door. On several previous occasions he had been annoyed by the visit of a young man named Miles Weatherill, a check weaver, to whom he appears to have given some offence by forbidding him the house. Weatherill had found a sweetheart in one of Mr. Plow’s former servants, who had been in consequence sent home to her friends near York. Since her dismissal Weatherill had frequently threatened to have his revenge, and he had so pertinaciously annoyed Mr. Plow by hanging about the place, that a private watchman was engaged for a time to watch the house and prevent him from intruding upon the grounds. Hearing the disturbance at the back door, Mr. Plow suspected another visit from Weatherill. He bade the servants remain in the house while he himself went out of the front door to see for himself. On going round he saw Miles Weatherill standing against the back door. The moment Weatherill caught sight of Mr. Plow he cut, with a small axe he had in his hand, a cord which he had fastened round the handle of the door to prevent the door from being opened from inside. This done, he drew a pistol from his belt and snapped it at Mr. Plow, but the cap missed fire. He then struck Mr. Plow on the head with the axe, unlatched the door, and dragged Mr. Plow into the lobby. While Weatherill was still dealing desperate blows with the axe the three women servants came to the assistance of their master. They seized Weatherill by the hair, and so held him while Mr. Plow, who seemed stunned with the blows, and was staggering with loss of blood, escaped by the front door. One of the servants ran out at the same time to fetch assistance. Of the two other servants, Weatherill singled out the nursery-maid, Jane Smith, whom he accused of “telling tales” about his sweetheart and himself, and whom he had previously threatened he would be revenged upon. After locking the hall-door, and then fastening the back-door, he attacked the young woman with an axe, cutting her in so fearful a manner that one

of the blows nearly severed her hand from the wrist. She ran screaming into the dining-room, and endeavoured to close the door against Weatherill, by pressing against it as well as she was able. She was overpowered, and Weatherill, contriving to insert his arm between the door and the lintel, shot her dead with a pistol. The women were screaming in the utmost terror, while Weatherill cried out, "Where's my Sarah?" The doors of the Parsonage were fastened at the front and the back, and no habitation was within hearing distance. At this stage of the tragedy Mrs. Plow's nurse, looking over the balusters down into the lobby, saw Weatherill reloading his pistol. After looking for the axe (which he appeared to have mislaid) he went into the kitchen, and when he came again into the lobby the nurse saw he had a poker in one hand and a pistol in the other. He put out the gas in the lower rooms, and went upstairs, still tauntingly repeating the question about his "Sarah." The nurse met him at the bedroom door and tried to stop him, saying, "Those you want are downstairs," to which he replied, "I have finished them, but you needn't be afraid, for you've done me no harm." He pushed her on one side, went into the bedroom, and attacked Mrs. Plow. He drew off the bed-clothes, fired a pistol at her where she lay, and the shot not taking effect, he began to batter her about the head and face with the poker. In the midst of the attack the parish-clerk (George Stansfield) and two gentlemen whom the servant who had escaped had called upon for assistance, and whom the surviving servant downstairs had let into the house, made their appearance, seized Weatherill with the poker in his hand, and so rescued Mrs. Plow from imminent death. It was found that the bullet had passed through the bedding, the wadding remaining on the sheet. The pillow, with all the upper part of the bed, was covered with blood.

Mr. Plow, on escaping by the front door, went to the house of Mr. Greenwood, the organist to the church. This house is about fifty yards from the Parsonage. At that time Mr. Plow had a pistol in his hand. The cap had been snapped, but the pistol had not been discharged. Before Mr. Plow could tell all that had occurred he fainted through loss of blood. Mr. D. N. Cockcroft, the surgeon to the family, was sent for, and with the assistance of Mr. W. Longbotham, who was also called in, the wounds were dressed. There were two large scalp wounds, one on the top and the other at the back of the head. There was also a deeply-cut vertical wound between the temples. There were several lesser wounds and contusions about the face and body, and the left ear was torn from top to bottom. The Rev. gentleman was conveyed back to the Parsonage, where, after lingering for a time in a very critical state, he died of his injuries.

Weatherill, on being subsequently taken to the police-station and searched, was found to be wearing a belt, tied behind with a piece of cord, and apparently made for the purpose he was about to execute. There were four slit-holes in it, in which he carried

the pistols. It seemed, on a comparison of the statements of the several witnesses, that he must have had four pistols. Two were found at the rear of the Parsonage (where they probably fell during the struggle with Mr. Plow), a third was wrested from him by Mr. Plow in the lobby, and with the fourth he shot the housemaid, and reloaded it before going upstairs to attack Mrs. Plow. On a further search the police found in his pocket a quantity of gunpowder, a lot of bullets and caps, and some loose shot. He himself assisted the police in the search, and produced voluntarily a photograph of the young woman whom he called "his Sarah," and also a portion of a link of a jet necklet. The link appeared to have been broken in two, half being probably retained by Weatherill and the other by his sweetheart as a "love-token." When the money he had in his possession was being taken from him, he expressed a wish that it might be given to his mother, with whom he lived, and whom he seemed now to remember suddenly. He said to the constable, "Let's have an understanding about this money—let's see how much there is." The amount was 17s. 5½d. He then said, "Please tell mother what has happened, and tell her as kindly as possible. Say I sha'n't be home to-night." He appeared to be under the impression that he had caused the death of Mr. and Mrs. Plow, as well as of the housemaid. Referring to this, he said, "I've done all I wanted to do. I'm only sorry the — pistols did not go off better."

3. **MURDEROUS AFFRAY.**—A desperate attempt to murder policemen took place at about a quarter past two o'clock p.m. Mr. Hill, an ex-policeman, while on his way home through Finsbury-square into Chiswell-street, was rapidly passed by two men, who turned the corner of Whitecross-street. Mr. Hill watched, and was about to follow them into Whitecross-street, when a man standing at the corner fired a revolver almost point-blank in his face. He repeated the shot twice, and then walked quietly away, holding the pistol behind him. By this time a policeman in uniform had come up and seized the assassin, and Hill lent a hand. A desperate struggle then ensued, in the course of which the fellow discharged the two remaining chambers of his revolver, but he was finally overpowered. He was an Irish shoemaker, named Thomas O'Hearn. Fortunately none of the shots took effect: but Hill had a narrow escape of his life, as two pieces of percussion cap entered his right eye.

At his examination before Mr. Cooke, O'Hearn treated the matter very lightly, and tried to prove that it was a case of mistaken identity. It was alleged, as a motive for the conduct of prisoner, that he frequented a public-house which was one of the haunts of O'Keefe, Desmond, and others connected with the Clerkenwell outrage, and that Hill had been employed to watch that house. The prisoner was found guilty and sentenced to penal servitude for life.

11. **HURRICANE IN THE ISLE OF MAURITIUS.**—A tremendous

hurricane visited the British colony of Mauritius in the night, and drove twenty vessels ashore in the harbour of Port Louis, and destroyed, wholly or partially, many buildings in the town and in the adjoining district. Even stone buildings, the walls of which could resist the force of the wind, were stripped of their roofs, commonly made of zinc or galvanized iron; and for the wooden houses there was much less chance. Hundreds of tons of sugar in the storehouses, and probably a fourth of the growing crop, were estimated to have been lost. The hurricane blew down two sections (each weighing 124 tons) of the railway bridge over Grand River, three miles from Port Louis. This bridge is about 620 feet in length, and is composed of two iron tubes—one about 250 feet, and the other 370 feet—supported by six columns 120 feet high. The tubes, or girders, are nine feet square, and are unfortunately open at the bottom, which gave the wind a greater purchase. The consequence was, that the smallest of the tubes (250 feet) was blown off the columns, to which it was not fixed, nor was it joined to the other girders, as the weight was thought sufficient to keep it in its place. The columns supporting the girders are circular, and of iron filled with concrete; they were not in the least injured. Arrangements were made to continue the railway service from the other side of the river, the starting point being three miles from Port Louis. The railway workshop and some of the machinery were much damaged.

12. ATTEMPT TO ASSASSINATE THE DUKE OF EDINBURGH.—The Duke of Edinburgh, while accepting the hospitality of the friends of the Sailors' Home at Clontarf, near Port Jackson, New South Wales, was shot in the back by one O'Farrell. The wound, though dangerous, was not fatal. Within two days of its infliction the ball was extracted, and within eight days His Royal Highness was sufficiently recovered to go on board his ship.

The following telegram from Galle was received at the Colonial Office from the Earl of Belmore, Sydney:—

"On March 12 a person named O'Farrell deliberately shot His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh in the back at a public picnic given in aid of the Sailors' Home at Clontarf, Middle Harbour, Port Jackson.

"Providentially the wound was not fatal, and he is now able to go on board his ship, and hopes shortly to resume his duties.

"The ball was easily removed on Saturday, March 14, by Doctors Watson and Young, of Her Majesty's ships Challenger and Galatea. O'Farrell fired another shot the moment he was seized, which severely wounded a gentleman named Thorne in the foot; the ball has been extracted, and he is doing well. The assassin, who avowed himself to be a Fenian, was arrested on the spot.

"In consequence of the report of a medical Board, Commodore Lambert has ordered His Royal Highness to return to England as soon as he is sufficiently recovered, which will probably be next week."

Immediately on receipt of the news the Duke of Buckingham proceeded to Osborne to communicate it to Her Majesty.

Another telegram, dated Sydney, March 31, 1868, was afterwards received by the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos from the Earl of Belmore, which stated that the Duke was progressing favourably.

The Sydney "Morning Herald" gave the following account of the outrage and of the arrest of O'Farrell:—"When Sir William Manning heard the discharge from the pistol, and saw His Royal Highness fall, he turned and sprang at the would-be assassin, who then jumped back and aimed the murderous weapon at Sir William. Seeing the pistol directed towards him, Sir William stooped to evade the shot, and, losing his balance, fell. Fortunately the charge did not explode; but, as Sir William Manning was in the act of rising, the ruffian took aim a third time. Just at this moment Mr. Vial, coachbuilder, of Castlereagh-street, who happened to be behind, sprang upon the cowardly assailant and pinioned his arms to his side. Upon finding himself pinioned in this way, the first thought of the miscreant was to shoot the man who had thus prevented him from further carrying out his bloody purpose, and, getting his right hand sufficiently at liberty to point the pistol, he endeavoured to aim it over his shoulder at Mr. Vial; but, being unable to effect his purpose without a risk of shooting himself, he directed his aim to the spot, as nearly as he could judge, where His Royal Highness was lying, and (as he has since confessed) endeavoured to shoot a second time the royal victim of his murderous attack. Fortunately for His Royal Highness, the assassin's aim was diverted from its object, and the bullet intended for the person of the Prince entered the foot of Mr. George Thorne, sen. The scene which followed almost defies description. No sooner had Mr. Vial grasped the man who had fired the shots than several other gentlemen also seized him, and had it not been for the closing in around them of the police and other persons, they would speedily have placed him beyond the reach of the law courts. The people shouted, 'Lynch him! Hang him! string him up!' and so on; and there was a general rush to get at him. Unfortunately for Mr. Vial, some of the people mistook him for the Prince's dastardly assailant, and for a few seconds he was treated unmercifully. In the meantime the police, headed by Superintendent Orridge, got hold of the assassin, and they had the greatest difficulty in preventing the infuriated people from tearing him limb from limb. The task of putting the prisoner on board the ship was not an easy one, and it was fully ten minutes before they could get him on to the wharf. By that time all the clothing from the upper part of his body was torn off, his eyes, face, and body were much bruised, and blood was flowing from various wounds; and when he was dragged on to the deck of the "Pater-son," which was lying at the wharf, he appeared to be utterly unconscious. No sooner was he on board than a number of sailors

had a rope ready to string him up, and it was only by the interference of Lord Newry that his life was spared."

Further telegrams, from the Earl of Belmore to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, intimated that the assassination of the Duke was attempted by O'Farrell in consequence of messages sent from conspirators in this country, which ordered the Prince's death. It was understood that O'Farrell was selected by lot to perpetrate the crime, and that the attempt would have been made when the Prince landed in state, but that an opportunity of doing so without risk of injury to others did not occur.

The New South Wales Government offered 1000*l.* reward for the apprehension of each accomplice.

The attempt on the life of the Duke caused an universal horror and indignation throughout the colonies. Great demonstrations took place, and numerous addresses were made, and prayers and thanksgivings were offered up in all the churches.

All that the would-be assassin O'Farrell said upon his examination was, that the task of executing the Prince had been sent out to him, but that he failed, and was not very sorry that he did fail.

On the 26th of March, O'Farrell was brought up for trial at a special sitting of the Central Criminal Court, held at Darlinghurst. The trial was adjourned for a few days on the ground of the absence of a witness necessary for the defence. The prisoner was then found guilty; and when asked if he had any thing to say why sentence should not be pronounced, replied, in a firm tone, "No, sir, nothing." Sentence of death was then passed in the usual form, and the extreme penalty of the law was inflicted on him at Darlinghurst gaol, April 21st. The culprit left a written statement with express instructions that it should not be opened until after his death. The document was addressed (in the prisoner's own handwriting), to "The Hon. H. Parkes, colonial secretary, to be opened to-morrow, April 21, 1868." The envelope was opened in the presence of the inspector-general of police, at about eleven o'clock on that day. In it O'Farrell denied that he was connected with any person or any organization in his attempt to compass the death of the Duke of Edinburgh. It also contained a statement to the effect that a short time prior to the attack, he addressed communications to the conductors of two Irish publications, in which he mentioned his intended attack, and fully expected to carry out his purpose. Orally, the prisoner expressed a belief that in consequence of one of the persons to whom these communications were addressed having been convicted, the letter would be intercepted by the authorities, and would be in the hands of the Imperial government some time before the news of the attack upon his Royal Highness reached home. O'Farrell denied any connection with the Fenian organization further than this, that he sympathized with the movement and contributed money towards the object which its promoters had in view.

approaching visit to Ireland had been received with so much cordiality, and he hinted that this visit might be the prelude to a more permanent stay in Ireland at a future period.

The subscriptions amounted to 1,200*l.*, including 100*l.* from her Majesty the Queen, and 100*l.* from the Prince.

20. CAPTAIN MACKAY SENTENCED.—The trial of Captain Mackay, of whose arrest on the 7th of February an account has been given, terminated at Cork this evening in a verdict of "Guilty." With this case the interest of the Fenian prosecutions may be said to have been exhausted. There was a reckless dash in the young "Captain" which made him a favourite with the people, and he evinced some manly and generous qualities, which, if they did not win sympathy from others, mitigated their hostility. The court, therefore, was densely crowded during his trial. The soldiers in charge of the Martello Tower at Fota clearly identified Mackay as the leader of the party who attacked and rifled the tower on the 27th of December last (see "Chronicle" of last year). Evidence was given of insurrectionary proceedings at Castlemartyr, Knockadoon, Kilmallock, and Kilcooney Wood, also of the arrest of the prisoner under the Lord-Lieutenant's warrant, and his discharge in April, 1866, on condition of his leaving the country. An undertaking to this effect was produced in his own handwriting. A Roman Catholic clergyman identified him as a person who got married in the church of SS. Peter and Paul, Cork, on the 20th of July last, under the name of Lemasne.

Mr. Heron, Q. C., addressed the jury on the part of the prisoner. His speech consisted chiefly of a denunciation of Corydon, the chief witness, whom he called upon them to disbelieve, and censured the Government for employing.

Mr. Exham, Q. C., replied, and Mr. Justice O'Hagan charged the jury, who, after an absence of two hours and a half, returned into court with a verdict of "Guilty," accompanied by a recommendation to mercy.

The prisoner had the frankness to acknowledge that he had received a fair trial, and that the verdict was a just one. He was sentenced to twelve years' penal servitude.

24. FIRE AT EASTWELL PARK.—Shortly before midnight a fire broke out at the residence of the Earl of Winchelsea, Eastwell Park, near Ashford, Kent. The flames were first observed issuing from the roof over the north front of the house, and owing to the high wind then blowing they rapidly spread. The floor above the dining-room, and shortly afterwards the glass dome over the chief staircase, fell in, destroying much valuable property. Engines from Ashford, and one from the neighbouring seat of Sir Richard Tufton, were quickly on the spot. Happily, by the exertions of those who manned them, the fire was confined to the north front of the house. Several very valuable pictures were totally destroyed. The loss was estimated at 12,000*l.* Both the house and its contents were insured.

APRIL.

2. EXECUTION OF A WOMAN AT MAIDSTONE.—Frances Kidder, who was convicted at the late Assizes for the county of Kent for the murder of her step-daughter, thirteen years of age, was hanged this morning, in front of the county gaol at Maidstone.

Kidder had shown symptoms of hatred to her step-daughter, who was about twelve years old, on many occasions, and on August 17 last took her out under pretence of going to a fair at New Romney, but returned home at ten o'clock at night, wet through, with a statement that she and the deceased had been frightened into a ditch by some horses, and that she had been unable to get the poor girl out. The body of the deceased was found in a ditch, where the water was not more than a foot deep, and there were marks of a struggle on the bank. It also appeared that the prisoner, although bent upon so horrible a purpose, had considered economy and compelled the poor child to take off her holiday clothes and put on an old ragged frock, besides which she changed her own dress with a like object.

4. OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE BOAT-RACE.—The twenty-fifth boat-race between the Universities drew a larger assembly than ever to the Thames side, and the rush of horsemen across Barnes-common was very great. Oxford has gained three-fifths of the victories; and, since her memorable length in 1860 (as a compensation for her sinking the year before), Cambridge has failed to score. This year the time (twenty-one minutes, with a good tide) was the quickest on record. The steamer arrangements were excellent, and the "London's Pride," with the Prince of Wales and Prince Arthur on board, the Conservancy yacht, and the umpire's boat commanded a good sight of the crews throughout, but did not interfere with them; whilst the "Camelia" and the "Sunflower," chartered by the *Life* and the London Rowing Club respectively, were well up at the finish. The rest of the boats, laden almost to the water's edge with dupes, who year after year pay a crown to see nothing of the race, were, as usual, beaten far away. Oxford, whose crew was nine pounds and a half heavier, was, of course, the favourite; but, even their friends did not believe them to be so good as they proved. Although the Cambridge men won the toss and gained a slight advantage at starting, their style was flurried and bad, and one of them caught three crabs. The Oxford men, who soon got their long "vengeance stroke" into play, had really won their race, pulling only thirty-six strokes a minute, at the end of half a mile. At the Craven

point they crept up, and at Hammersmith Bridge they led by a clear length. Past Chiswick the Oxonians were rowing forty strokes, and the Cambridge thirty-eight, as before. The latter made a gallant struggle up to Barnes Bridge, but without effect, as the dark blues drew further away, and won, amid profound silence, by six lengths. Cambridge had been gradually dying off, and a hundred yards from home they virtually gave up pulling. Sympathy for their repeated defeats made the crowd forget the fine rowing of the winners, and the light blues received nearly all the cheers as they paddled back. A large party dined, as usual, under Mr. Denman's presidency, at Willis's Rooms. The chairman replied to Mr. Skey's theory of the evils of training; and Mr. Still, the Cambridge captain, gave it as his opinion that if the annual race were given up it would be the death-blow to boating at Cambridge. The remembrance of last year should quite atone for the disappointment of 1868. It is said that the "willow Camuslingers with delight" a good deal too much about Cambridge. In fact, it is becoming so shallow and dead with mud and weeds that it is impossible to practise a long and quick stroke in it, and a crew coming fresh from it to the Thames "feel as if their boat was running away with them." Still, last year showed that with proper heart and muscle-material, and a Griffiths as stroke, they could make a good fight. Pinckney, their stroke of this year, acquitted himself very fairly, considering his lack of power.

The names and weights of the crews were as follows:—

OXFORD.			CAMBRIDGE.		
	st.	lb.		st.	lb.
1. W. D. Benson, Balliol . .	10	13	1. W. H. Anderson, First Trinity	11	
2. A. C. Yarborough, Lincoln	11	8	2. J. P. Nicholls, Third Trinity	11	3
3. R. S. Ross, of Bladensburg, Exeter	11	7	3. J. G. Wood, Emmanuel . .	12	6
4. R. G. Marsden, Merton . .	11	13	4. W. G. Lowe, Christ's . . .	12	4
5. J. C. Tinné, University . .	13	9	5. H. T. Nadin, Pembroke . .	12	11
6. F. Willan, Exeter	12	7	6. W. F. MacMichael, Downing	12	1½
7. E. S. Carter, Worcester . .	11	8	7. J. Still, Caius	12	1
Stroke, S. D. Darbishire, Balliol	11	3	Stroke, W. J. Pinckney, First Trinity	10	10
C. R. W. Tottenham, Christ Church (cox.)	8	7	T. D. Warner, Trinity Hall (cox.)	8	4

The time of the race, as taken by a chronograph made by Mr. F. Dent, of Cockspur-street, was 20 min. 56 sec.

— EXECUTION OF THREE MURDERERS.—Miles Weatherill, the Todmorden murderer, and Timothy Faherty, the Droylsden murderer, were executed at the New Bailey Prison, Salford, Manchester, in presence of from 20,000 to 25,000 spectators. The details of the shocking crimes for which Weatherill was executed have already been given (see "Chronicle" of March 2).

The Droylsden murderer, Faherty, though his crime did not attain sufficient celebrity to qualify his likeness for a place in Madame Tussaud's, was guilty of a murder no less brutal and unprovoked. But he belonged to a class easily worked upon by mere animal passion. He was not like Weatherill an intelligent artisan,

but an uneducated Irish labourer, originally from Galway. After being twelve years a private in the 40th Regiment, he came to Manchester, where he had relations, and had been for some time earning a decent livelihood in connexion with the Manchester gas-works. During his service in the neighbourhood of Rochdale-road he made the acquaintance of a factory operative, whom he courted, named Mary Hanmer. Mary had remarked in her suitor habits of dissipation, which led her to distrust and finally to reject him. The estrangement played upon Faherty's mind, and on Christmas-eve he paid a visit to his sweetheart, which was destined to be the last meeting they would have on earth. Mary Hanmer continued firm in her resolve. Timothy Faherty was vainly importunate, and the result was the murder of the unfortunate woman, Faherty taking up a poker and laying her prostrate on the floor, and then following up the blow, which was already fatal, by striking her again and again with the same instrument. It is doubtful whether he had meditated this crime; on the contrary, it appeared that he was preparing to revisit his mother at Galway.

The morning was exceedingly mild and fine, and many of the people present had travelled long distances to witness the horrid spectacle. One remarkable circumstance, as showing the public sense of any mitigating facts being wanting connected with the commission of these crimes, was the absence of any attempts to influence the Secretary of State in favour of mercy. There were the usual ribald exhibitions of the crowd in front of the gallows for some hours previous to the final scene, but the awful tragedy itself provoked a better feeling, and towards the close a more orderly and well-behaved multitude has seldom been witnessed on such occasions. The preparations inside the prison had been completed by eight o'clock.

Faherty had exhibited a good deal of nervousness during the process of pinioning, but shortly afterwards he appeared to have regained the mastery over his feelings which he had exhibited during his trial and subsequently. He was attended in his last moments by the Rev. Father Gadd (being a Roman Catholic), who had all along administered such spiritual consolation to him in prison as his nature was susceptible of, and who reported of him that he had latterly exhibited a becoming consciousness of his awful position. Weatherill went through the pinioning process with almost unexampled fortitude, and his conduct all through the trying ordeal preceding the execution was such as to challenge the admiration of Calcraft, who said he had never, in the whole of his long experience, witnessed such nerve and unfaltering resolution. The Rev. Mr. Caine, the Protestant chaplain of the gaol, reported that he had become truly penitent, and had acknowledged the justice of his sentence. Almost immediately the clock struck eight the door opening from the prison upon the scaffold was thrown back upon its hinges, and Faherty came to the front with a firm and unfaltering step. He gazed upon the vast crowd with calmness and deliberation. He had a cross suspended from his neck,

and bore a missal between his clasped hands. He was dressed in deep mourning, which contrasted strongly with the ghastly paleness overspreading his features. He was attended by Mr. Gadd (his confessor), by the governor of the gaol, the hangman, and two police-officers. Turning his gaze from the crowd, he looked upward and his lips moved. The white cap was then drawn over his face and the rope adjusted in the ordinary manner. Weatherill was then brought to the front, attended by the chaplain of the gaol. He looked deathly pale. His appearance was followed by an instantaneous murmur. He, too, showed no sign of faltering, but, on the other hand, his demeanour and even his attitude gave a complete contradiction to the reports as to his inhuman callousness. His wish that he might be permitted to hold in his hand the copy of the Church service which was found in his possession after the murder was complied with. Neither of the doomed men attempted to speak to the people.

Every thing being in readiness, Calcraft quitted the platform, and before one could again draw breath the bodies swung in the air. Some convulsive twitches were observed, and then all was over. There were no symptoms of disorder in the crowd; the only sounds at the last were the peculiar gasps of sensation as the successive stages of the awful ceremony were accomplished, and the sudden wailing of women, of whom there were many present, as it concluded.

Frederick Parker, who was convicted at the late York Assizes of the murder of Daniel Driscoll, was executed at noon on the same day at York.

The prisoner and the deceased had been in Beverley House of Correction for a short time, and were liberated on the 29th of February. They were seen in company together at Beverley and Bubwith, which is within three miles of the scene of the murder, which (according to Parker's own confession) was not perpetrated until about six o'clock on the following morning. While the deceased was then fastening his boot and was in a stooping position, Parker, who before leaving Beverley conceived the idea of possessing himself of Driscoll's silver watch and chain and between 4*l.* and 5*l.* in money, struck him several blows on the head with a formidable bludgeon, and left him dead in the ditch by the roadside, after plundering him of the property just referred to. The prisoner's exhibition of the watch and money shortly afterwards led to his apprehension, and the proof was very conclusive.

He was said to have been very penitent before he died.

7. ASSASSINATION OF MR. M'GEE IN CANADA.—An atrocious crime, equalled only by the attempt on the life of the Duke of Edinburgh, was committed by the Fenian conspirators in Canada. The Hon. Thomas D'Arcy M'Gee, who represented Montreal West in the House of Commons sitting at Ottawa, after delivering an eloquent speech in the House of Commons, in favour of loyalty and unity among the British North American colonists, was shot

dead from behind, as he arrived at the door of his own lodgings, and at the moment when he stopped to put his latchkey in the door. The agent of this bloody deed was a person named James Whelan, a journeyman-tailor of Montreal, who had been lurking about Ottawa several months, always with his loaded pistol, and had been accustomed to watch Mr. M'Gee from the gallery of the House of Commons, and to follow him about the streets.

Mr. D'Arcy M'Gee was most earnestly opposed to the Fenian conspiracy; and had, during the last three years, directed his utmost exertions, by speech and writing, to warn his countrymen against it. The influence which he justly possessed among the Irish of Lower Canada, as well as among those in Ireland who knew his proved sincerity as an Irish patriot, made him very obnoxious to the Fenian party. The plot to murder him was hatched at Montreal, but not without the connivance of the chiefs of that infamous conspiracy at New York.

Whelan was subsequently tried and condemned to death.

9. EXECUTION AT SHREWSBURY.—John Mapp, the young man condemned at the Shrewsbury Assizes for the murder of a little girl on her way home from the meeting-house on a Sunday night; was hanged at Shrewsbury. He confessed his guilt, which he had hitherto persistently denied.

13. EASTER MONDAY VOLUNTEER REVIEW AT PORTSMOUTH.—The Grand Volunteer Review at Portsmouth was the most successful that has yet been held. The whole number in the field when the manoeuvres and sham fight took place at Portsdown was 28,000; and 16,000 marched past the inspecting officer, Lieutenant-General Sir G. Buller, on Southsea-common, at an earlier hour, before going out to Portsdown. The fortifications upon that range of hills and along the Hilsea lines, with some gun-boats in the creeks between Porchester lake and Portsmouth harbour, took part in the mimic battle. The entire programme was executed with equal spirit and precision, to the gratification of many thousands of spectators. The sham fight began at a quarter before two and ended a quarter before four in the afternoon. There was no hindrance and no confusion; the weather was fine, and those who had come from London went back early in the evening.

The morning was full of promise for the success of the day. By six o'clock the sun was shining over the town and harbour, and steamers were coming across from Ryde conveying men, women, and children to witness the volunteer review. The Portsmouth people were all astir, and crowds were at the railway station to await the arrival of the volunteers from London. At the end of the Cambridge-road, the main thoroughfare from Landport to the High-street, a triumphal arch had been erected. It was formed of timber, and rose eighty feet from the ground, surmounted by two lions. The sides were decorated in sections of bright colours. Spanning the pavement right and left were smaller arches, springing from the main structure. Every house along the

Cambridge-road hung out banners and streamers inscribed with words of welcome to the volunteers, whom the Portsmouth people, in all sorts of festive devices, hailed, together with the army and navy, as "England's Defenders." At the suburban end of High-street were another arch and four-and-twenty flag-staffs, bearing shields with the arms of the town and various heraldic compliments addressed to riflemen. This arch was covered with evergreens, with which garlands were intertwined. Close to the Government-green was a third arch of a less elaborate character, but also very handsome. But the volunteers did not march as a body under these arches, since, by a judicious arrangement, they were brought round to Southsea-common, where they "marched past" by a different route, not going through the town: From the railway station there is a line of railway to the dockyard, which passes through a large open space used as a People's Park. This is opposite to the station and at the other side of the road. The station-master was enabled to pass ten or a dozen of the London trains on to this park without stopping them at the ordinary terminus; so that the men descended on an open space not far from the rendezvous, and the empty trains were out of the way of those coming down after them. The result was that the arrival platform was kept clear. No fewer than forty-eight trains arrived within the short period of two hours and a half. The first left London about half-past four, and reached Portsmouth by half-past seven o'clock. The last of the metropolitan corps was landed by ten. This result proved that to so important a point of our defences as Portsmouth any number of men that could, under any circumstances, be required might be brought from all parts of England within a very few hours. The rendezvous for the entire force about to take part in the day's operations was on that portion of the glacis of the Portsmouth lines extending from the Cambridge-road to Southsea-common. From the station all the way were direction-posts at short intervals indicating the exact spot on the glacis to which each corps was to proceed for the purpose of forming and being brigaded. In doing this none of them had to march more than a few hundred yards on the public road. Almost as soon as they were out of the shed or of the People's Park, they were on the Government ground, from which the public was excluded; and, consequently, they were able to make all their preliminary arrangements without the slightest confusion.

Precisely at ten o'clock a gun was fired as the signal for the general body of the troops to brigade on the glacis and prepare for the march past. The arrangements on the common were admirable. The portion occasionally used as a race-course was railed off for the troops. Outside the rails, on each side, were lines of spectators. Half-way between the point of entry from the glacis and that of exit, at the opening of the Portsdown-road, was the saluting-point, with ample stands to the right and left, to which spectators were admitted by payment. To the rear of the saluting-

place and the stands was Spithead, and the Isle of Wight farther off, with a great expanse of sea. On the other side of the common the flags of the Civil Service, the London Scottish, the London Irish, and several other of the metropolitan corps, floated from the tops of the hotels and private residences facing the water; and every window commanding the common was crowded with ladies, who joined in greeting the volunteers as they arrived on the ground. After the usual galloping of staff officers and orderlies here and there and every where, several regimental bands stationed themselves opposite to the saluting point, and immediately afterwards General Sir George Buller, the commanding officer of the day, arrived at the flagstaff, surrounded by a brilliant staff.

It had been decided that in the sham fight the enemy should be represented by the First and Second Divisions, and the defence be maintained by the Third and Fourth Divisions; but a departure was subsequently made from this plan, so far as to place the regular troops in the army of defence. Just before the march past was commenced the cavalry were drawn up on the right of the guns, and at eleven o'clock the order was given to advance. First came the cavalry, entirely composed of volunteers, then a field battery of the Royal Artillery, and next two battalions of the Marine Artillery, numbering over 1000, and after them a pontoon train. The 35th and 97th Regiments of the Line preceded the volunteers, whose appearance in marching past was creditable to their drill. They turned to the left, after passing the Grand Stand, and moved off the common, going to Portsdown-hill. It had been determined that in the case of the attacking troops the marching past should be dispensed with, and, further, that certain of the country corps should not be brought into Portsmouth at all. To the extreme right of the battle ground is a railway station at Havant, and to the extreme left another at Fareham. At each of these, corps were landed by train, so that they were able, after a very short march, to take up their positions as a portion of the attacking force. The London riflemen had, however, all to march out from Portsmouth; but those of them who joined in the march past had only to go as far as the Hilsea lines. The scene of action was a broad, open valley, formed on one side by the Hilsea lines of Portsmouth island, and on the other by the amphitheatre of high sloping hills on which the Portsdown defences have recently been built. Between the Hilsea lines and the attacking force lay the creek communicating with the waters of the harbour beyond, and up the centre of the enemy's position on Portsdown-hill ran the old London road. Between the two armies at the bottom of the valley, lay the villages of Cosham and Wymering. These were the keys of the whole position, the loss of which was to be the signal for the route of the assailants. Up near Wymering, at a place called Paulsgrove, the harbour was wider and deeper, and here the Hilsea garrison had the assistance of their gun-boats in annoying the enemy's right. The enemy—that is to say, the First and Second

Divisions—were supposed to have advanced from Fareham, to have taken the three great forts on Portsdown-hill, and to have made the great defences of Widley and Southwick the base of their operations against the main inner lines beyond the creek at Hilsea. The theory of the defence was that the Third and Fourth Divisions were the defenders of the lines, aided by field-batteries, a powerful brigade of the Royal Marine Artillery, and the 97th and 35th Regiments. These were to repulse the attack on the lines, and, under cover of their own artillery and the fire from the gun-boats, make a sortie across bridges over the creek and pontoon bridges, carry the villages of Cosham and Wymering, and so, forcing the position up the London road, entirely turn the enemy's right and drive him back over the Portsdown hills.

At a quarter before two the fight commenced. The attacking party had massed their divisions strongly on the hill, where their artillery of position, was stationed on the summit of the ridge. They began by the advance of a powerful body of skirmishers in line against Hilsea. These were too strong for the garrison outposts, which, after holding some thickets and hedges to give time for their supports within the lines to assemble to their aid, were driven back a short distance. After the first alarm had spread, the lines of Hilsea bristled with thousands of troops. Up and down, far and near, the line of fire spread, and soon the artillery began to roar. That of the attacking force replied, and the guns became more and more vehement as the rifles ceased. But now, from the sea and up the narrow creek, in which the tide was at its full, came the Stork and Fancy gun-boats, towing the large launches and cutters of the Terrible, Gladiator, Victory, Duke of Wellington, Royal Oak, and Pallas, each carrying a rifled gun at the bows. The fire which they instantly poured into the right wing of the enemy at once decided matters. A hasty retreat was therefore made from the space in front of the lines back to the railway, the ridges of which they lined, holding both Cosham and Wymering as covers to their right and left flanks. No sooner had they made this movement than the garrison made a general sortie, with a vigour which drove all before it. They swarmed from all the works of the lines, and instantly as they reached the open their skirmishers were thrown out, reserves placed, and a rapid advance made against the enemy. It was wonderful to see the ease and precision with which they formed up their ranks, even while advancing. At one part of the lines the bridges were not sufficient to give egress to the forces in the manner which the emergency demanded. A pontoon-bridge was formed across the creek. This bridge was constructed and fit for the passage of infantry within ten minutes from the time of its commencement, and within fourteen minutes artillery passed over it. The sortie from all parts of the garrison now became general, and in such masses that the enemy were borne down, and had nothing left them but to recall their skirmishers and supports, and, leaving a thin line in thickets

and hedgerows to annoy the advance, concentrate their strength in the village of Cosham and Wymering. The taking of these villages was one of the most animated parts of the whole day's programme. For the first time the volunteers fought in the streets and amid the houses. Every foot of ground was contended for in alleys, houses, and stables; and the scene as, with all the village windows crowded, the enemy was driven from point to point, was most exciting. The loss of Cosham at once necessitated a retreat of the defenders from Wymering, and a change of front along the Portsdown hills to meet the attacking force, which, by the possession of the London road, had quite turned their left flank, as their right had been turned by the fleet at Wymering. The enemy were ranged in masses of lines between Forts Wilder and Southwick. The lines of infantry, now deployed in front of each other, maintained a file fire which was absolutely deafening; and the uproar of cannon was terrific. In the midst of this great din and rush of guns and troops, the 97th and 35th Regiments of the Line, with the Royal Marine Artillery, were brought up the road on the enemy's right, and came into action against the flank of the enemy with their breech-loaders. It seemed an incessant volley, under which the enemy were supposed to wither away; and it being then a quarter to four, the time agreed upon, the bugles were ordered to sound "Cease firing!" and the review was brought to a close. The dispersal of the various brigades and corps, and their breaking up to march off from all parts of the ground to their various rendezvous were among the finest sights of the day. The casualties were very few. One man had his hand injured by a cartridge, another hand was injured by a ramrod. There were two medical cases—one of palpitation of the heart, and the other of exhaustion.

Twenty trains had been kept ready at the station to bring the volunteers back from Portsmouth. The first of these left at 5.35 p.m., and the last got away by a quarter-past seven. The ordinary traffic, which had been suspended from 4.15, was resumed before half-past seven, a special train being kept ready for volunteer stragglers. Under the supervision of Mr. White, the station-master, similar arrangements had been made for the management of the up trains as those which had answered so well in the morning; and the result was that, at a quarter-past nine, there was no crush or difficulty, and the traffic between Portsmouth and London went on as usual.

— OPENING OF THE ST. JOHN'S-WOOD RAILWAY.—This line, which is rather more than two miles in length, was opened for public traffic, having been officially inspected by Captain Tyler, for the Board of Trade, on the 11th; but the directors, with a large party of shareholders and other friends, made their first trip over it, and visited each of the stations, on the 1st, when they were entertained with a luncheon at the Marlborough-road station. The line commences at Baker-street and passes beneath the Park-road to near Lord's Cricket-ground, where a station has been built. All

the stations are built across the line on very deep girders, which support the buildings in the centre. From the Park-road station the line passes under the Wellington-road to the Marlborough-road, where is another station, and thence under the New Finchley-road to the Swiss Cottage, which for the present serves as the terminus. The line being mostly under private property has enabled the engineers to give open-air stations, which was impossible in the case of the Metropolitan stations at Gower-street, Portland-road, and Baker-street. The greatest engineering difficulty was in the stiff nature of the subsoil. Another difficulty arose in passing over the Regent's Canal, where the line has to rise at a gradient of one in sixty. But this was a trifling work compared to taking all the sewerage under the canal at such a level that it was always within a yard of the water over it. The work was accomplished by driving iron cylinders beneath the canal; and, though sometimes within less than three feet of where the keels of the barges passed over them, there was no leakage or delay of any kind. Beyond this first gradient over the canal there are neither curves nor gradients worth speaking of. The whole line has been built on what is called the "cut and cover" principle, and the foundations of the tunnel sides are carried down deep into the clay and then laid on concrete. The railway has been constructed as a single line, with double lines at each station. Provision has, however, been made for constructing a double line when necessary, and also for carrying it on to Hampstead. All the works were carried out by Messrs. Lucas and Aird, whose experience in underground lines most peculiarly fitted them for such a task. The engineers were Mr. John Fowler and Mr. Johnstone.

14. REVIEW OF THE INNS OF COURT VOLUNTEERS AT WIMBLEDON.—The Inns of Court Volunteers did not take part in the proceedings at Portsmouth, but, in conjunction with four companies of the Oxford and Cambridge corps, held a field day at Wimbledon. In the evening the University Volunteers were entertained at dinner by the "Devil's Own" in the Middle Temple Hall.

15. VISIT OF THE PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF WALES TO IRELAND.—The Prince and Princess of Wales set foot on Irish soil, and were received with all the enthusiasm natural to the occasion. They came from Holyhead, with the Duke of Cambridge and Prince Teck, on board the royal yacht Victoria and Albert, which was commanded by Captain the Prince of Leiningen. It was accompanied by the Admiralty yacht Enchantress, with a party of distinguished visitors. They left Holyhead at five o'clock in the morning, arriving at Kingstown twenty minutes before nine. They had been preceded by several iron-clad vessels belonging to the Channel Fleet, those vessels being the Minotaur (Captain Goodenough), the flagship of Admiral Warden, C.B.; the Warrior (Captain Boys), the Achilles (Captain Vansittart), and the Defence (Captain May). The fleet was accompanied by the tenders Helicon

(despatch-vessel), and Pigeon (gun-boat). The ironclads arrived at daybreak, and took up a position, in two lines, a mile off shore, outside the harbour. The royal yacht had a most favourable passage from Holyhead. There was little or no wind, and the sea was almost as smooth as the water of a mill-pond. About five miles from land the Victoria and Albert was met by the Tarifa, one of the Cunard line of steamers, and several other vessels, which had been despatched from Dublin and Kingstown to meet the royal squadron. The Victoria and Albert was saluted by the ironclads in passing through their squadron, with the Enchantress and the despatch-boat Helicon. The royal yacht, having anchored in the harbour, was left undisturbed till ten o'clock, when a deputation of the Kingstown commissioners went on board and presented a loyal address. At the same time the Princess received the gift of a white dove, as a token of peace, which was presented to the Queen when she landed here in 1849. The appointed landing-place was the Victoria-wharf, near the railway station at Kingstown, where a pavilion had been erected for the purpose of enabling the royal visitors to set foot on the Irish shore under the most comfortable circumstances. This structure was commodious enough, but not very elegant. It was a wooden shed, built in the form of a boat-house, having the floor covered with crimson cloth, and having at the point of landing the letters "V.R.," with the figures "1849," to indicate the spot on which her Majesty the Queen stepped when she first visited her Irish subjects. On each side of the pavilion were raised tiers of seats for the accommodation of a number of ladies and gentlemen who had secured tickets to witness the landing. These seats were all occupied an hour and a half before the time fixed for the debarkation, which was twelve o'clock. Towards the harbour a guard of honour, supplied by the Grenadier Guards and accompanied by the band of the regiment, was drawn up; and on the land side the royal carriages and the cavalry escort, furnished by the 10th Hussars—of which regiment the Prince of Wales is Colonel—were in waiting. During the morning large numbers of people arrived by rail and road from Dublin, Bray, and Wicklow, and from many small towns or villages in the vicinity. By eleven o'clock a large crowd was collected upon the quay, and occupied the esplanade which surrounds the railway station.

Shortly before noon his Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant (the Marquis of Abercorn), accompanied by the Marchioness of Abercorn, arrived, and took up a position in readiness to receive the Prince and Princess on their landing. They were accompanied by Lord Claud John Hamilton, M.P., A.D.C., and Ladies Albertha, Georgiana, and Maude Hamilton; by his Serene Highness Prince Edward of Saxe-Weimar, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Strathnairn, G.C.B., Commander of the Forces; the Vice-Chancellor, Mr. Justice Keogh, the Earl of Mayo, the Attorney-General, Major-General Cunynghame, C.B., Admiral Buckle, Admiral Warden,

the Hon. Colonel Fielding, Colonel Mackenzie, C.B., Colonel G. W. Mayow, Colonel Henry, C.B., R.H.A., Colonel Seager, Brigadier-General Little, Brigadier-General Borton, Colonel Bentinck, Colonel Maude, the Hon. Luke Gerald Dillon, the Hon. Charles Fowler Bourke, Sir Bernard Burke, Ulster King of Arms; Sir John Marcus Stewart, the Hon. Jenico Preston, Dr. Burke, Dr. J. S. Hughes, and many others.

The royal yacht, having been unmoored from its first berth, was now brought alongside the wharf. The Prince of Leiningen came on shore, and invited the Lord-Lieutenant on board. His Excellency, the Marchioness of Abercorn, the Ladies Hamilton, and Lord Claud John Hamilton accordingly proceeded on board, and tendered to the Prince and Princess of Wales a welcome to Ireland. After a brief conversation the royal party made preparations to land. The Lord-Lieutenant offered his arm to the Princess of Wales, and conducted her on shore. Her Royal Highness was followed by the Prince of Wales and the Marchioness of Abercorn, behind whom were the Duke of Cambridge and Prince Teck with Lady Georgiana and Lady Albertha Hamilton. The appearance of their Royal Highnesses was greeted with a loud burst of cheering. Ladies waved their handkerchiefs and gentlemen their hats. There could be no doubt as to the heartiness of the welcome thus offered to the royal visitors; and both the Prince and Princess appeared highly pleased with their reception. The Princess looked very well; and, as she graciously acknowledged the acclamations with which she was greeted, her countenance was lighted up with that bright and pleasant smile which won the hearts of the people of London on her first arrival in England. She wore a dress and jacket of deep-blue tabinet, or poplin, trimmed with Irish lace; and a white bonnet of Irish lace, ornamented by a single rose. The Prince was in morning costume, and in the breast of his blue frock-coat he wore a rose, surrounded by a bunch of shamrocks. He also wore a cravat of the Irish colour, green. As soon as they landed, the royal standard was displayed from a flag-staff close to the pavilion, and a royal salute was fired by the guard-ship, the Royal George, taken up by the squadron outside the harbour, and repeated by a battery of the 7th Brigade of Royal Artillery on the East Pier. While the great guns were still thundering, and the people were cheering, the Prince and Princess of Wales took their seats in an open carriage, accompanied by the Duke of Cambridge and Prince Teck, and, amid the acclamations of the crowd, drove off towards Dublin. The royal carriage was preceded by that of the Lord-Lieutenant, containing the Marquis and Marchioness of Abercorn and his Excellency's aides-de-camp, escorted by a troop of the 12th Lancers, at the head of which rode Colonel Lake, C.B., commander of the Metropolitan Police of Dublin. The carriage of the Prince and Princess of Wales was escorted by a troop of the 10th (Prince of Wales's Own) Hussars. The third

and fourth carriages contained the Marchioness of Carmarthen, the Hon. Mrs. Stonor, Viscount Hamilton, the Hon. James Macdonnell, and Mr. Holzmann.

The route taken was along the Crofton-road, Blackrock-road, Seafeld-avenue, and Seapoint-road, to Blackrock. Here a triumphal arch was erected in the neighbourhood of the Town-hall, and twenty-five young ladies, attired in white dresses, were assembled. Miss Vance, daughter of the chairman of the Town Commissioners, handed the Princess of Wales a bouquet of exotic and spring flowers. From Blackrock the *cortège* moved on by Balls-bridge and Pembroke-road, to the canal bridge at Baggot-street, where it entered the City of Dublin, and passed through the principal streets and squares to the Castle. The streets were filled with enthusiastic crowds, who cheered wildly as the procession passed by. The Lord Mayor and Aldermen, and the other members and officers of the Corporation, had joined it at the city boundary. The procession, with its guard of lancers and hussars in front, and the Lord Mayor's gilded coach in the rear, was very imposing.

Passing the City Hall the royal party received the greetings of the ladies and gentlemen who thronged the stand in front of the building on a level with Hogan's marble statue of O'Connell. There was some trouble in making way into the castle yard, for the space at Cork-hill was crammed. By the efforts of the mounted police the way was cleared, and at half-past one, the Prince and Princess of Wales were welcomed by the Lord-Lieutenant at the residence prepared for them.

After a brief interval, the Lord Mayor of Dublin and the members of the Corporation were presented to their Royal Highnesses in the Throne-room, where an address was presented to the Prince, who said, in reply, "The reception which the Princess and myself have this day experienced calls forth our warmest and most heartfelt acknowledgments. It has been my most anxious desire since I last visited Ireland to return to it accompanied by the Princess; and I regard her presence this day, equally with yourselves, as a happy omen for the country, although I have never for a moment doubted your constant and undiminished attachment to the Throne of her most gracious Majesty the Queen. It will be a great pleasure to me to be present at the inauguration of the statue of one of Ireland's most distinguished statesmen, and to be enrolled and installed a Knight of the illustrious Order of St. Patrick." The streets of Dublin were partially illuminated in the evening.

On the 6th their Royal Highnesses went to the races at Punchestown, near Naas, in Wicklow, going by railway to Sallins, and thence in a carriage. They started from the King's-bridge terminus at half-past twelve. The special train, drawn by a powerful locomotive, gaily decorated with evergreens, included a state saloon-carriage, which was of unusual length, richly

upholstered in blue silk and damask, with white and blue fringes, and luxuriously furnished with fauteuils and reclining chairs, while the introduction of looking-glasses gave a pretty effect to the interior. With the royal party were the Duke of Cambridge, Prince Teck, the Lord-Lieutenant and the Marchioness of Abercorn, the Ladies Hamilton, the Earl of Mayo, the Earl of Shrewsbury and Talbot, Lord H. Lennox, Colonel the Hon. A. Hardinge, the Hon. E. Edgcumbe, A.D.C., Sir James Ferguson, Lord James Butler, Sir John M. Stewart, the Earl of Mountcharles, Mr. Gustavus W. Lambert, Lord Strathnairn, the Hon. Luke Gerald Dillon, and Mr. Cockerell.

The Princess of Wales wore a dress of pale green silk, richly trimmed with lace, and a light-coloured zephyr burnous. Her bonnet was of white lace, adorned with simple flowers. The party reached the grand stand at Punchestown at twenty minutes past two. There was an immense concourse of people in carriages and on foot awaiting their arrival on the ground. The royal party took their seats in the pavilion next to the Grand Stand. The Princess, as well as the Prince of Wales, took a lively interest in the proceedings. The weather was brilliantly fine, and almost sultry. The racing commenced at half-past two and ended at half-past five o'clock. No serious accident occurred, although the race-course was obstructed by the crowd pressing in front of the Grand Stand to see the Prince and Princess. The numbers exceeded those at any previous gathering there. The royal party left the course at a quarter to six for Sallins, and left for Dublin by special train.

The Prince of Wales again went to Punchestown on the 17th, which was the second day of the races. He rode a grey Arab on the race-ground. The Princess did not venture to incur the fatigue of another journey, but enjoyed comparative repose in town. A change of weather in the morning may have had something to do in determining her Royal Highness's resolution. Some heavy showers fell at an early hour; but the effect was very agreeable, and the condition of the ground was greatly improved. In the afternoon her Royal Highness paid a visit to the Alexandra College, an educational institution for ladies, with which she has graciously allowed her name to be associated. It was handsomely decorated with festoons of flowers; and the ladies of the college, who assembled to receive her Royal Highness, were most demonstrative in their welcome. As the royal carriage approached, the Princess had a floral shower cast upon her, and was presented with a beautiful bouquet by one of the pupils, while the Archbishop of Dublin handed a congratulatory address to her Royal Highness. In the evening the Prince and Princess and twelve hundred of the nobility and citizens were entertained at a ball in the Mansion House. Their Royal Highnesses arrived at eleven o'clock. They were enthusiastically cheered on their way through the streets. They were also most heartily greeted on entering the ball-room.

The Princess wore a dress of pink satin and flounce of Irish lace, presented to her by the ladies of Ireland. The ball was opened by the Prince of Wales with the Lady Mayoress, and the Princess with the Lord Mayor. Prince Teck, who wore the blue uniform of an Austrian officer of Hussars, danced with the Marchioness of Abercorn, and the Lord-Lieutenant with the Marchioness of Carmarthen.

The grand ceremony of the installation of the Prince of Wales as Knight of St. Patrick took place on the 18th in Dublin, and passed off with all the *éclat* of a great state ceremonial. St. Patrick's Cathedral was crowded with a brilliant and distinguished company. The proceedings, under the management of Sir Bernard Burke, Ulster King of Arms, were very imposing. The Prince and Princess, with the Marquis of Abercorn, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, went in procession to St. Patrick's Cathedral from the Castle. The procession was escorted by a detachment of Lancers and a squadron of Carabiniers. The first carriage was occupied by the Lord-Lieutenant, the Marchioness of Abercorn, Captain Stewart, and Sir H. Pelly. Next came, escorted by a detachment of the 10th (Prince of Wales's Own) Hussars, the royal state carriage, containing their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess. The Prince wore the uniform of a general officer, and the Princess a dress of blue, the tint used in the mantle of the Order of St. Patrick. The reception accorded to the Prince and Princess was more cordial, if possible, than on the occasion of their arrival in Dublin. The other carriages and their occupants were:—Third—state coach and pair (Duke of Cambridge's)—his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, Colonel Clifton, and two esquires. Fourth—state coach and pair (Prince of Wales's)—the Marchioness of Carmarthen, the Hon. Mrs. Stonor, Sir W. Knollys, and Viscount Hamilton. Fifth—coach and pair—Ladies G. and A. Hamilton and Lord C. Hamilton and Mr. Howard, aides-de-camp. Sixth—carriage and pair (Lord-Lieutenant's)—Lady Maud and Lord G. Hamilton; Lords F. and E. Hamilton and the Hon. H. Lambton, his Excellency's three pages. Seventh—carriage and four (Prince of Wales's)—Major Grey, Colonel Kingscote, Hon. C. Crichton, Hon. C. Molyneux. Eighth—carriage and four (Prince of Wales's)—Mr. Fisher, Dr. Minter, Hon. T. St. Lawrence and Mr. Butler, his Royal Highness's pages. Ninth—chariot and pair—Captain the Hon. J. Dormer and Captain the Hon. C. Edgecumbe, aides-de-camp in waiting. Tenth—Earl of Mayo's carriage. Each carriage was preceded and followed by detachments of cavalry, and the occupants were loudly cheered by the crowd. Before the procession reached the cathedral the gorgeous equipages of the Lord Mayors of Dublin and London fell in. The different uniforms of the soldiery, the many-coloured dresses of the ladies, the gorgeous liveries of the grooms and servants, the splendid horses, drawing magnificent coaches, and the bright sunshine over all, made up a brilliant scene. In this form the

procession proceeded by way of Dame-street, College-green, Grafton-street, Nassau-street, Dawson-street, Stephen's-green, York-street, Aungier-street, Bishop-street, Kevin-street, and Guinness-street, to the west door of the cathedral.

In order to prepare it for the installation, the interior of St. Patrick's Cathedral had been partly transformed. Standing at the western end, one had an uninterrupted view of the entire length to the extremity of the lady chapel, the screen separating that portion of the building from the church proper having been removed. Right and left in the side aisles rose tiers of seats covered with variously-coloured chintz. The pulpit was removed, and on its site a dais was erected; the choir galleries were constructed for the vocalists; the desks in front of the stalls were not to be seen; the Archbishop's throne had disappeared, and the prebendaries were relegated to temporary seats placed within the railing. The great western door was also removed, and a curtain of scarlet cloth was substituted for it. At the western entrance to the cathedral, arrangements had been made for the reception of the knights and their esquires. A handsomely-constructed *porte cochère* was erected, with its side open to Patrick-street, and beneath this the carriages set down their occupants. Contiguous to the *porte cochère* and at each side of the entrance, a commodious pavilion, of an ornamental character, was fitted up as reception-rooms. The southern pavilion was appropriated to the Prince of Wales, his esquires, pages, and attendants. It was handsomely coloured, and decorated with various emblems of the Order of St. Patrick. One end was filled in with stained glass of appropriate design. In the decoration of this room the Prince's coat of arms and feather were conspicuously displayed. The other pavilion was devoted to the knights and their esquires. It was also handsomely painted and decorated. Between the reception-rooms and the western wall of the edifice covered galleries were erected for visitors, who had an excellent view of the procession as it descended the flight of steps leading to the church. At the head of this flight of steps a second curtain of scarlet cloth was suspended, separating the reception-rooms from the galleries. On the ceiling and partitions of the wooden structure were emblazoned the emblems of the Order; the badge, with its cross of red saltire and shamrock impaled, being particularly conspicuous. The monogram of the Order was also displayed.

After long waiting, a flourish of trumpets announced to the multitude that the procession had entered the church. The organ pealed forth a prelude; all the people in the cathedral rose to their feet; and the choir sang the National Anthem, while the procession slowly passed up the aisle. First came the dignitaries of the church in their surplices, and wearing the hoods showing their academical degrees; after which followed those more immediately connected with the proceedings of the day. Kettledrums and trumpets preceded the pursuivants in their quaint uniforms, Lord

George Hamilton and the Hon. Henry Bourke. Next came the members of the viceregal household, followed by the installed knights, in the following order:—

His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge. Esquires—Captain Ellis, Grenadier Guards; Captain Fletcher, 12th Lancers.

The Marquis of Clanricarde. Esquires—Captain Oliver Martyn; Mr. Lynch Staunton.

The Marquis of Conyngham. Esquire—Earl of Mountcharles.

The Earl of Howth. Esquires—Captain Williams Bulkeley; Captain Candy, 9th Lancers.

The Marquis of Headfort. Esquires—Earl of Bective; Lord John Taylour.

The Earl of Arran. Esquires—Lord Brabazon; Viscount Sudeley. Lord Farnham: Esquires—Hon. R. Maxwell, D.L.; Colonel Clements, D.L.

The Earl of Dartry. Esquires—The Hon. Robert Dawson; Captain Dawnay, of the Guards.

The Earl of Granard. Esquires—Reynolds Peyton, Esq.; Auchmuty Musters, Esq.

The Marquis of Downshire. Esquires—Earl of Hillsborough; Lord A. Hill.

The Earl of Cork. Esquires—Lord Richard Grosvenor; Mr. Arthur Smith Barry, M.P.

Lord Dufferin. Esquires—Gawan Hamilton, Esq.; J. Percival Maxwell, Esq.

Lord Lurgan. Esquires—The Hon. Francis Brownlow, 72nd Highlanders; Thomas B. Urquhart, 72nd Highlanders.

The Earl of Charlemont. Esquires—The Hon. Mr. Acheson; the Hon. Mr. Villiers.

The Earl of Dunraven. Esquires—The Hon. Henry Crichton, 10th Hussars; Mr. Liddell.

The Marquis of Drogheda.

The Prince of Wales followed, with the Lord-Lieutenant (Grand Master), the members of the Prince of Wales's household, the officers of the Order, and a number of aides-de-camp. The uniform worn by almost every one of these was different from that of the effect gentleman preceding him or the one coming behind, and the procession was exceedingly brilliant. The Prince of Wales and the Grand Master were attended by young noblemen as pages.

The Princess of Wales, accompanied by the Marchioness of Abercorn, was conducted by the Earl of Waterford (the Earl of Shrewsbury and Talbot), in his capacity of Hereditary Grand Seneschal of Ireland, to the dais prepared for her reception, the whole assembly rising to receive them.

The ceremony of installation was then proceeded with. The usual formalities having been got through by the officers of the Order, the choir sang Sir John Stevenson's "Te Deum," a musical composition written for the occasion of the installation of George

IV. The Marquis of Clanricarde and Marquis Conyngham, as senior knights present, then, by order of the Grand Master, descended from their stalls and girt his Royal Highness with the sword, the prelate (the Archbishop of Armagh) reading the following admonition:—"Take this sword, to the increase of your honour and in token and sign of the most illustrious Order which you have received, wherewith you being defended may be bold, strongly to fight in defence of those rights and ordinances to which you be engaged, and to the just and necessary defence of those that be oppressed and needy."

His Royal Highness was then robed with the mantle, the prescribed admonition being read by the Prelate as follows:—"Receive this robe and livery of this most illustrious Order, in augmentation of your honour, and wear it with a firm and steady resolution, that by your character, conduct, and demeanour you may approve yourself a true servant of Almighty God and a worthy Brother and Knight Companion of this most illustrious Order."

The Prince of Wales having advanced to the stall of the Grand Master, his Excellency invested him with the collar of the Order, saying, "Sir, the loving company of the Order of St. Patrick hath received you, their brother, lover, and fellow; and, in token and knowledge of this, they give you and present you this badge, the which God will that you receive and wear from henceforth to His praise and pleasure, and to the exaltation and honour of the said illustrious Order and yourself."

This being done, the senior esquire of the Prince unfurled and waved his banner; and, after a flourish of trumpets, Sir Bernard Burke, Ulster King of Arms, read the titles of his Royal Highness, thus:—"The Most High, Most Puissant, and Most Illustrious Prince Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, Duke of Saxony, Duke of Cornwall and Rothesay; Earl of Chester, Carrick, and Dublin; Baron of Renfrew and Lord of the Isles, Great Steward of Scotland, Principal Knight Companion of the Most Illustrious Order of St. Patrick, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, Knight of the Most Ancient and Most Noble Order of the Thistle, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, and Knight Grand Commander of the Most Exalted Order of the Star of India, a Member of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council," &c.

At the conclusion of the proclamation all resumed their seats, except the officers of arms and the esquires. The principal esquire presented the offering in a purse to the registrar; and Ulster, receiving the banner from the esquire, delivered it to the registrar, who deposited it within the rails. The esquires and officers of arms, with due reverence, then returned to their places, and the choir performed the grand anthem from "The Creation," commencing "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and concluding with the chorus, "The heavens are telling."

This being concluded, the choir sang the "Hallelujah Chorus" from "The Messiah," and then Ulster King of Arms rose, and, making three reverences to the Grand Master, waved his sceptre, whereupon the procession, marshalled as on entering the cathedral, moved down the middle aisle towards the great west entrance, where it fell to the right and left to allow the Grand Master, the Prince of Wales, and the Duke of Cambridge to pass to their carriages. They returned to the Castle. In the evening the Lord-Lieutenant gave a banquet to the Knights of St. Patrick, the royal visitors, and a select company, in St. Patrick's Hall.

On the 20th the Prince and Princess, with the other members of the royal family at Dublin, attended a grand review in Phoenix Park. In the evening the Lord-Lieutenant gave a splendid ball at the Castle.

On the 21st their Royal Highnesses visited Trinity College, where the Prince, the Lord-Lieutenant, and the Duke of Cambridge had conferred upon them doctors' degrees. With this ceremony was combined that of the inauguration of the statue of Burke. Speeches were delivered by Sir J. Napier, the Vice-Chancellor of the University, Chief Justice Whiteside, and the Provost of Trinity. Afterwards the Prince unveiled the statue. The reception of their Royal Highnesses, both within and without the College buildings, was most enthusiastic. In the afternoon the Prince and Princess visited the Hibernian Academy, the Cattle Show, the Catholic University, and other places. They every where met with a most cordial reception.

On the 22nd a grand ball was given in the Exhibition Palace. The royal party arrived at twelve o'clock, and consisted of their Excellencies the Lord-Lieutenant and the Marchioness of Abercorn; their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, attended by the Marchioness of Carmarthen and the Hon. Mrs. Stonor, Ladies in Waiting; Viscount Hamilton, and Major Grey, and accompanied by Ladies Georgiana and Albertha Hamilton, Lord Henry Lennox, Lords Claud, John, and G. Hamilton, Colonel Hardinge, &c., and attended by Captains Stewart and J. Dormer, aides-de-camp in waiting. A guard of honour, with the band of the 89th regiment, was stationed at the entrance of the building, where the viceregal and royal party were received by his Excellency's household and the stewards of the ball. The effect at this moment was strikingly beautiful. The vast assembly, numbering over 4,000 persons, stood in front of the galleries which surround the halls in brilliant files, and thronged the space below, leaving an avenue for the royal party to pass through; the bands played the National Anthem, and the people applauded with great enthusiasm. Dancing immediately commenced, and was kept up with great spirit until a late hour in the morning, the Prince and Princess mingling heartily in the enjoyments of the scene, and his Royal Highness plunging into the eddies of the waltz with the gay company which thronged the space without the barrier. The

royal party did not retire from the festive scene until half-past three o'clock.

On the 23rd their Royal Highnesses, with the Marquis of Abercorn, went to Powerscourt, in Wicklow, to visit Lord Powerscourt and to view the picturesque scenery of his estate. They were met and cheered by the people at Bray, and elsewhere along the road. On the 24th they went to the Horticultural Show, the National Gallery, the College of Physicians, the Mater Misericordiæ Hospital, and the Adelaide Hospital. The Princess presented the Queen's book to both hospitals for the use of the patients. The weather was beautiful, the streets were crowded, and the greetings were hearty. In the evening, at eight o'clock, the Prince and Princess left Dublin for Kingstown, and on their arrival went on board the yacht and entertained the Lord-Lieutenant and a distinguished company at dinner. The fleet was illuminated, and there was a grand display. Thousands of people were on the pier.

25. FOUNDING OF KEBLE COLLEGE, OXFORD.—The first stone of this College was laid by the Archbishop of Canterbury (it being the anniversary of Mr. Keble's birth), in the presence of a large number of distinguished personages¹. The ceremony was preceded by service in St. Mary's Church, where the Bishop of Oxford preached a sermon appropriate to the occasion. After the laying of the stone there was a large and most enthusiastic meeting in the Sheldonian Theatre—the Archbishop in the chair—when speeches were delivered by Lord Carnarvon, the Bishops of Oxford and Lichfield, and Mr. Gathorne Hardy.

MAY.

1. EXTRAORDINARY ATTEMPT TO MURDER IN THE CITY.—A shocking attempt to murder Mrs. Munns, a housekeeper, was made at some offices in Catherine-court, Great Tower-street. The unfortunate woman, with her face nearly battered in and her head covered with wounds, was found lying insensible on the door-step by her son-in-law. The door was open, and the assassins had escaped. They were afterwards taken at a coffee-house in the Strand. They were two brothers, named Smith—mere boys, aged fifteen and thirteen respectively. They had hidden themselves in the housekeeper's bedroom, with the intent to commit a robbery.

¹ The objects which the founders have in view, in addition to that of doing honour to the memory of the illustrious author of the "Christian Year," are to extend the benefits of University education by founding a College, the aims of which are to impart a Christian education, encourage industry, and discourage habits of expense.

She found them there, and they beat her with a mallet in the manner described to prevent her from raising an alarm. In a pocket of one of these young ruffians were found some gunpowder and percussion-caps, and a pocket-book; and at the back of the looking-glass in their bedroom, a broken pistol, a powder-flask, a box of fusees, and an opera glass. Under a chest of drawers were three fencing foils, and in a drawer two pairs of boxing-gloves.

2. BANQUET AT THE ROYAL ACADEMY.—Sir F. Grant presided at the annual dinner of the Royal Academy, when the principal guests were the Prince of Wales, Prince Christian, Prince Teck, and Prince Edward of Saxe-Weimar; the Dukes of Cambridge and d'Aumale; the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Dublin; the Bishop of Oxford, Honorary Chaplain; and several Cabinet Ministers, the Premier being absent at Osborne. Mr. Gladstone was also kept away by a severe domestic affliction. In returning thanks for his health, the Prince of Wales alluded to his visit to Ireland and the attempt on his brother's life in the following terms:—"I am sure I only speak the sentiments of the Princess as well as myself when I say that we were most deeply touched and gratified by the reception we met with in Ireland. I feel convinced that the people intended to be hearty and loyal; and it seemed as our visit was lengthened that they showed even more enthusiasm than they did at first. I will not trouble you by referring to, nor do I think it would be right that I should mention, any thing about our Irish policy; but I feel convinced that the Irish people are loyal to the core, whatever may be said either in this country or any other to the contrary. You have also alluded to the terrible and dastardly attack on my brother. He was performing the duties entrusted to him by the Queen, in representing her in her Australian colonies, being in command of one of the finest ships in her Majesty's navy, when he was wounded by the bullet of an assassin. Luckily, from the last accounts we received he is now recovering from the wound. It may, indeed, be said that he had a most miraculous escape, and I believe he is now on board his ship and on his way home. I wish, Sir Francis, to take this opportunity of thanking you for the kind interest you have taken in him, and not only for the interest in him here, but in all public places, and in the different newspapers. I am sure I shall but fulfil his desire, as his elder brother, in thanking you, and indeed every body in this country, for the kind interest they have taken in him."

The Duke of Cambridge, returning thanks for the Army, referred to the Abyssinian campaign. He remarked, "You have done me the honour to say that this expedition does me credit. Permit me to say that it reflects credit on those immediately concerned in it. It reflects great credit on that gallant and distinguished general, Sir Robert Napier, to whom, especially from the outset, its chief arrangement was entrusted, and it reflects the

highest credit on the officers and soldiers, both European and native, who have had the honour of serving under his command. I have had the opportunity of reading detailed accounts from time to time of the great difficulties which the expedition has had to encounter, and certainly the fighting part of the business has been by far the least serious. I need not tell you that fighting is one of those things which any man with right feeling and principle must consider the least disagreeable part of a soldier's duty. Long marches in a country with no roads; great stones here and great stones there; now 10,000 feet above the level of the sea, and a little farther on 5000 feet lower. To march an army 400 miles through an unknown country without roads and without conveyance of any kind, entirely dependent on its own resources, must be admitted to be a most difficult and trying duty. Then, with regard to the natives, they had to be dealt with, as they have been, with a delicacy and judgment which reflect the greatest credit on Sir Robert Napier. I may say the country ought to be proud of such an army and such a general. We may congratulate ourselves on having selected so good and so distinguished an officer to be placed at the head of the expedition, and giving him the entire management and control of the arrangements. The only merit to which I consider myself at all entitled is in the little assistance I have rendered—and I have had a very small share in it—for it would be most unjust if I did not say that her Majesty's Government have most materially aided Sir Robert Napier in the conduct of the expedition."

The Lord Chancellor returned thanks for the Ministers, and speaking for the strangers, the Archbishop of York ventured to dispute some criticisms of the exhibition that he had heard. It had been said by more than one artist that this year's exhibition fell somewhat short of the average:—"Presumptuous as I may seem, I shall venture still to question that opinion. There is a very great number of good works, a fair number of productions of remarkable excellence, and an almost total absence of those failures which lower the character of such an exhibition. It has probably afforded as much satisfaction and delight to those who have been permitted by your kindness to assemble here during the last two days as that of any former year. The only fault I feel disposed to find with it is that it is confined within these walls, and that a large portion of our countrymen will be beyond the reach of its ennobling influence. We want education among our people in every form of it. Take, for example, a town in my own county, in which I take a great interest—the town of Sheffield. Sheffield has got to learn the elementary lesson, and she will learn it by and by, that it is not necessary to hoist a man with a petard because you differ from him on a question of wages, and that it is possible to prepare for exportation keen weapons of offence without a certain dangerous proclivity that there is at present to the domestic employment of them. The preacher, and the teacher, and the

essayist will all do their best against this barbarism. Cannot art do something? The contemplation of such works as these is very good for cultivated men. We have all felt it so to be. Can the uncultivated derive nothing from them? I have seen hundreds on hundreds of working people studying with every appearance of enjoyment the works of art assembled in a far inferior exhibition to this. They would enjoy such productions, and in their own way appreciate them. This Academy has completed a century of its useful existence, and has raised the standard of art in this country. Let us hope that during the next century it may be able to make popular the art which it has done so much to raise."

His Grace concluded by proposing the "health of the President." Replying, Sir F. Grant said, "His Grace alluded to the observation of some very ill-advised artist who spoke of this exhibition as below the average. He must have been a very bad judge, for, so far as my experience goes, I have never seen a more remarkable one. I beg to state that the Academy, on the 10th of December next, will have completed its first century. I need not say how very anxious we are to inaugurate that event by holding our next exhibition in our new galleries at Burlington House. We even contemplate having an exhibition of a selection of the works of all the members of the Academy since its foundation to the present day, to be opened, if possible, on the 10th of December to inaugurate the centenary."

In the course of his remarks the President stated that the unprecedented number of 3011 works of art had been received for the exhibition, of which 2693 were pictures. He concluded as follows:—"In now returning thanks for the honour you have conferred on us, I hope I may be permitted to quote the words delivered on the last occasion in this room by the gifted and eloquent First Lord of the Treasury (Mr. Disraeli), in returning thanks for the House of Commons. Speaking of that body and the Royal Academy, he said that 'both are now ancient institutions; both in their time have been much criticized; both have been occasionally reformed; but, notwithstanding these comments and changes, they both still remain among the most flourishing and popular institutions of the country.'"

Sir Roderick Murchison, responding to the toast of the Royal Society, expressed the extreme gratification he experienced in having been so fortunate as to induce Sir E. Landseer to represent with his consummate genius an episode in the life of a brave and honest ancestor of his own.

The next toast was "Prosperity to the Interests of Literature," and was responded to by Mr. Froude.

6. DINNER OF THE LITERARY FUND.—This was held at the Freemasons' Tavern, and presided over by Mr. Disraeli. The large hall was completely filled, and among the guests were Earl Stanhope, M. Van de Weyer, Earl Beauchamp, Lord Mahon, Lord J. Manners, Sir J. Packington, Lord Royston, Dean Stanley, the

Bishop of Rochester, Lord H. Lennox, Lord Houghton, Lord Sidmouth, Lord Ravensworth, Lord Colchester, Lord Fitzwalter, Lord Hylton, the Right Hon. Stephen Cave, M.P., Colonel Wilson Patten, M.P., Sir W. Hutt, M.P., Chief Justice Bovill, Sir J. Napier, Lord Justice Wood, Sir R. Murchison, the Solicitor-General, General Sir W. Codrington, &c. A number of ladies were also present, including Mrs. Disraeli, Countess Beauchamp, and Lady Stanhope. In proposing the health of the Queen, Mr. Disraeli said, "I cannot forget that since I last had the honour of dining with the Literary Fund her Majesty has inscribed her name in the memorable list of royal authors; and her Majesty has experienced a fortune which has not always been the fate of royal authors, or even of those of another description, for her Majesty has found thousands and hundreds of thousands of readers for her volume. Nor is that surprising, for all those who have read her Majesty's pages must have found in them that 'touch of nature' which makes all hearts kin." In proposing the health of the Prince and Princess of Wales, and the rest of the royal family, the right hon. gentleman said, "The royal family is peculiarly connected with this institution; for his Royal Highness has deigned to fill the chair which I now occupy, and in doing that he only followed the example of his illustrious father—a prince who did more for the refinement of the taste of the country than any prince that ever flourished since the days of the Medici. And there are peculiar causes which, on this occasion, must force us to drink this toast with feelings of no common emotion. All of us must have read with feelings of alarm and indignation the attempt that has recently been made in a distant settlement of the Queen upon the life of one of her children. That attempt was, I think, unjustly associated with the name of Ireland; but if any thing could have proved triumphantly the injustice of that aspersions, it was the reception which at that very moment was being accorded by a loyal and generous people to another child of her Majesty. His presence in that isle, with the charming partner of his life and state, proved, what I have never doubted, the entire loyalty of that gifted people."

On rising to propose the toast of the evening, Mr. Disraeli was received with loud and repeated rounds of cheers, and spoke at considerable length, dwelling upon the usefulness of the Literary Fund, and the great obligations of society to literature. "Why," he asked, "have the great empires of the past so little influence upon our life to-day?" The answer was that they had left us no books—they had left us no literature. "We have heard of their conquerors, their priests, and their statesmen, but never of their authors, and this want of influence upon the living generation is not the consequence of the lapse of time. There are countries that were coeval with them—countries that flourished 3000 years ago, which, after the attainment of a certain degree of material comfort, gave up their mind to the cultivation of the intellect, and produced

a literature of startling originality; and though they were not countries of great extent, they exercise, unto this day, constant influence upon the life and conduct of the existing generation. There is not a day that incidents of their history do not illustrate our life; there is not a day that their household words do not animate and adorn the hearths round which we live; at this very moment there is no part of the world which is not influenced by the conduct and thought of nations who, in population and extent, were very inconsiderable. But they exercise, and will perhaps exercise for ever, this influence; and why? Because they left us literatures, and because they had authors." England might look with pride and satisfaction on her vernacular literature, which is the admiration of the world. "It would be invidious," said Mr. Disraeli, "at this moment to name instances; but I think I am speaking only the truth when I say that we live in an age when the voice of true poets is heard; when our language is working with a vigour and versatility which was never exceeded; when historical investigation has been conducted with an ornate sagacity that very few periods of literary excellence could rival, and when the revelations of science have been communicated to the multitude in a classic tongue which certainly a century ago was wanting to those invaluable labours. I say, therefore, that we can boast of our vernacular literature, not merely that it has produced classical authors at a particular epoch, but that with its exuberant reproductiveness there is a vigour and versatility, and a power of expression, that assures the commanding influence of the English language. I confess, for myself, that I am not surprised at this result. We, as Englishmen, must be proud of it; but I think it may be accounted for. I attribute it in a great degree to the wide circle to which an English writer appeals. It is no longer an appeal merely to the inhabitants of the immediate circle in which he lives. If he is capable of it, he can affect the feelings and influence the conduct of the inhabitants of every Transatlantic city. His production may soothe the labours and solace the lives of the dwellers in the antipodes. It is in this great and expanding tribunal to which the English author can appeal, that I find the finest elements of his inspiration." The right hon. gentleman concluded by appealing to his audience for support to the institution whose anniversary they were celebrating. Earl Stanhope responded to the toast. The other toasts were "The Church," proposed by Earl Beauchamp, and responded to by the Bishop of Rochester; "Poetry and Imaginative Literature," proposed by Sir S. Northcote, and answered by Mr. Venables; "The Judges and Legal Literature," given by Lord Houghton, and acknowledged by Chief Justice Bovill; and "Classical and Historical Literature," proposed by Lord Ravensworth, and replied to by Dean Stanley.

10. RELIGIOUS RIOTS IN LANCASHIRE.—The borough of Ashton-under-Lyne was the scene of great rioting and disturbance, arising out of the spirit engendered between the English Protestants and

Irish Romanists by the lectures of the well-known Mr. Murphy. A junction of processions from Dukinfield, Stalybridge, and Ashton having been formed, two of the principal Irish quarters of Ashton were attacked, and a good deal of furniture was destroyed in the houses of the residents. As may be supposed, all this was not accomplished without some severe fighting, in which many people were badly hurt. In the evening St. Omer's Catholic chapel and school were attacked by the mob, and much damage done. After that St. Mary's Catholic chapel and school were attacked. The bell was sounded to give notice of the approach of the attacking party, and a considerable force of Irish Romanists rallied to defend the buildings. These were ultimately overpowered, and a good deal of injury sustained, the fittings and windows being destroyed. Some shots were fired, and one person was said to have been wounded, but no lives were lost. The magistrates were assembled, and the borough and county police were reinforced as soon as possible by special constables, but it was not till a late hour that order was restored. Many arrests were made, and the prisoners were taken before the magistrates, but only to be remanded while evidence could be obtained against the principal offenders. A notice was posted on the walls, under the authority of the mayor and magistrates, stating that the Riot Act had been read, and warning the inhabitants of the consequences that might follow any renewal of the disturbances.

On the evening of the 11th there was a renewal of the disturbances at Ashton, and it was found necessary to call in the aid of the military to quell it. Shortly before seven o'clock the English element assembled in Henry-square, and marched direct to Charles-street and Hill-street, better known as Reyner-row, and commenced sacking the houses in that locality, which are principally inhabited by the lower class of the Irish people. The rioters met with little or no opposition, and in a very short time every house in the row was forcibly entered, the window frames and doors were smashed to atoms, and the furniture and bedding were hurled into the street, where they were burnt. Tables, chairs, sofas, pictures, chimney-glasses, ornaments, carpets—all were thrown into one heterogeneous mass, and consumed by the flames. Information of the work of devastation was conveyed to the Town-hall, and in the absence of the Mayor, Mr. Hugh Mason, Mr. James Kenworthy, and other magistrates, were speedily on the spot. It was found that the rioters had received a considerable accession of numbers from Stalybridge, armed with the most formidable weapons, and it was determined at once to have recourse to military aid. Accordingly a messenger was despatched to the Ashton Barracks, where the troops had been confined, under arms, the whole of the day. In the course of a quarter of an hour a troop of the 6th Enniskillen Dragoons arrived at the trot and charged the mob, who fled in all directions, merely to meet again and renew their work of destruction when an opportunity afforded. The arrival of the dragoons was

speedily followed by two companies of the 70th Foot, the whole being under the command of Colonel Cowper. The soldiers were heartily cheered by the mob, but no sooner had they cleared one street than the rioters returned by another route, and resumed their dastardly work until again interrupted by the soldiers. This state of things did not, however, last very long, for the specials were so disposed of that the mob were kept continually on the move, and those who possessed dangerous weapons were disarmed. The military were set at liberty about eleven o'clock, and the special constables, with the exception of No. 1 Company, were also dismissed to their homes. The Mayor and other magistrates remained at the Town-hall until two o'clock on the 12th, and every thing being then reported quiet, the whole of the specials were dismissed, as also were the members of the county constabulary, who had remained on duty up to that time. A meeting of the magistrates was held during the night, at which the Mayor suggested that a committee, consisting of the whole of the magistrates, should be appointed for the purpose of inquiry into the necessities of the poor people who had been rendered homeless, and to make temporary provision for their wants. The appeal was promptly responded to by the magistrates present, including the Mayor. The town was patrolled throughout the night, but no further disturbance occurred. ●

During the rioting on the 11th a respectable woman, the wife of Mark Bradbury, of 59, Park-street, was trampled to death by the crowd. The unfortunate woman had gone to the end of the street, about twenty yards from her own door, when the rioters made a sudden rush from Hill-street, pursued by the police, and in the confusion which prevailed Mrs. Bradbury was knocked down and literally trampled to death. When picked up her breast was found quite black with footprints. Dr. Nowell was speedily in attendance, but life was extinct. The deceased was sixty-seven years of age, and was much respected by her neighbours. St. Ann's Catholic chapel was again attacked on the night of the 12th, but the police prevented them from doing any damage beyond breaking the few window-panes that remained.

When the rioters in Reyner-row found that they were overpowered, the cry was raised, "To Stalybridge," whither a large body of them at once proceeded, followed by the borough police to the boundary at Cock Brook. Here they were met by the Stalybridge force, strengthened by a large body of special constables. The mob, seeing the preparations that were being made to receive them, turned off at Reyner's Mill, the object being to get at their destination by Baily's new road. In this they were partially successful, reaching Lee's-row, Bridge-street, which is thickly populated by Irish of the lowest class. The houses of the poor people were attacked, and the work of destruction speedily commenced; but this had not continued long before the constables arrived on the scene, and charged the rioters in capital style, driving most of them into the River Tame. A section of the mob succeeded in

dais, when the company sang in unison the Old Hundredth Psalm. The Archbishop pronounced the benediction. The military bands played a grand march, and the royal party were conducted by the authorities of the hospital to their carriages. On their way back to Buckingham Palace and Marlborough House the royal party were heartily cheered.

— THE PRINCE OF WALES AT ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL. —The annual "view" or inspection of St. Bartholomew's Hospital by the governors took place, and on this occasion the Prince of Wales, as President, for the first time took part in the ceremony, going through the wards and examining all departments of the hospital. He was conducted through the wards by the treasurer, Mr. Foster White, accompanied by the almoners and by the members of the medical and surgical staff. In the evening his Royal Highness occupied the chair at the annual festival, which was held in the great hall of the hospital, according to custom. The guests were about 240 in number; and the Prince was supported right and left by Prince Christian, Viscount Hamilton, Lord Henry Lennox, Lord Alfred Hervey, the Bishop of Oxford, General Knollys, the treasurer of the hospital, Archdeacon Hale, and Mr. Arthur Helps. The company included several of the aldermen of London, who are governors of the hospital, and many others of the governing body, with the physicians and surgeons of the institution.

14. DEATHS OF TWO UNDERGRADUATES AT OXFORD.—At about one a.m. Mr. Robert Marriott, commoner of Christ Church, in attempting to climb from his window in Peckwater Quadrangle, to that of another undergraduate, fell to the ground, injuring himself so severely that he died about twenty minutes afterwards. A coroner's inquisition was held at Christ Church, and the jury, after inspecting the spot from which the deceased was supposed to have fallen, returned a verdict of "Accidental death from a fall."

Deceased, who was master of the Christ Church Harriers, was highly popular in his college, where, as throughout the University, the sad event cast a deep gloom. He was the eldest son of the Rev. J. P. Marriott, of Cottesbach, Leicestershire.

Scarcely had the painful feeling consequent upon the untimely death of Mr. Robert Marriott, of Christ Church, been partially allayed, than the University was the same afternoon again startled by a report that an undergraduate of Exeter College had been shot at the rear of Magdalen College. It appeared at the inquest that the gentleman in question, Mr. James Watson Barne, in company with Mr. A. M. Gordon, a member of the same college, had been shooting with a saloon pistol from a punt on the river, near the Water-walks, that Mr. Gordon had pointed the pistol towards deceased, thinking it was not loaded, and that it went off, lodging its contents in deceased, who died shortly afterwards. Evidence was given which fully proved, if proof had been necessary, that

the deceased and Mr. Gordon were on the most friendly terms, and that the occurrence was purely accidental. The jury returned a verdict of "Accidental death."

18. OPENING OF THE LEEDS ART-TREASURES EXHIBITION.—The Prince of Wales, attended by Lord Alfred Hervey, General Sir William Knollys, and Major Teesdale, left Marlborough House for Leeds. The Prince travelled via the Midland Railway to Woodlesford station, arriving at five o'clock. His Royal Highness was received at the station by Earl Fitzwilliam and by Mr. Meynell Ingram, whose guest the Prince remained during his stay in Yorkshire. His Royal Highness drove to Templenewsam, the residence of Mr. Ingram, escorted by a squadron of the Yorkshire Hussars. A concourse of some 15,000 persons assembled to greet the Prince upon his arrival. A royal salute was fired from Colonel Reilley's battery of horse artillery. Mr. and the Hon. Mrs. Ingram entertained a large party at dinner, in honour of their royal guest, and later in the evening there was a dance. On the 19th the Prince inaugurated the Art Exhibition in the New Infirmary central hall. His Royal Highness, accompanied by Earl Fitzwilliam, Mr. Meynell Ingram, and Lord Frederick Cavendish, drove in an open carriage from Templenewsam to the New Infirmary, a distance of seven miles, a numerous and distinguished party following. Throughout the line of route was displayed every kind of floral decoration, and banners floated from every available point. The reception of the Prince as he drove slowly through the borough was heart-stirring, thousands of persons with one voice expressing their loyal enthusiasm. The Mayor and Corporation, with an escort of the Yorkshire Hussars, met the royal cortège at St. Patrick's Church. The procession halted before the parish church, where the Sunday-school children were assembled, and the children sang "God Bless the Prince of Wales." The royal procession arrived at the Exhibition at one o'clock. A guard of honour was formed of a detachment of the Rifle Brigade. The Prince entered the hall accompanied by the procession of the Mayor and Corporation, the Mayors of various other northern towns, the members for Yorkshire and Leeds, the Bishop of Ripon, the various official personages connected with the Exhibition, his Royal Highness's suite, and the officers in command of the several military detachments in attendance. The Prince took his seat on the dais, welcomed by the enthusiastic cheers of the assemblage. The National Anthem was sung, after which the Mayor presented an address to the Prince, to which his Royal Highness made a gracious reply. "The Heavens are telling" was afterwards sung, and the chairman of the executive committee read an address from that body, to which the Prince gave a gracious reply. A prayer was offered up by the Bishop of Ripon, and the Prince was afterwards conducted over the Exhibition. After an hour's inspection, his Royal Highness returned to the dais, and, in the name of the Queen, declared the Exhibition

opened. The "Hallelujah Chorus" was then performed, and the Prince retired, amid the acclamations of the people. After partaking of luncheon, his Royal Highness returned to Temple-newsam. In the evening the Prince was present at a ball given by the Mayor and Mrs. Fairbairn at the Town-hall, at which about a thousand guests were present. His Royal Highness opened the ball with Mrs. Fairbairn. The Prince left Leeds at a quarter to one on the 20th, and returned to London.

20. SEVEN PUPILS DROWNED WHILST BATHING.—A melancholy accident occurred at Mudeford, near Christchurch, by which seven young pupils of the Rev. Joseph Fletcher, Congregationalist minister of Christchurch, lost their lives.

It appears that the whole of Mr. Fletcher's pupils, eleven in number, accompanied by the German tutor, Herr Frederick Geyer, and the French tutor, M. Guesdon, left the rev. gentleman's house, chiefly for the purpose of having a bathe off the beach at Mudeford, but three of the pupils and M. Guesdon went for a walk to Winkton instead. The remaining nine, including Mr. Geyer, proceeded to bathe off the beach on the eastern side of the old steamer, and opposite Highcliff Castle. The names of the eight boys were Joseph Newsome Milne, Henry Atlee Pewtress, aged fifteen, and his brother, Arthur Howard Pewtress, aged eleven, whose parents reside in London; Leonard Moser, aged thirteen, and Horace Moser, aged twelve, sons of Frederick Moser, Esq., of Carberry, Bournemouth; George Frederick Johnson, aged thirteen, of Croydon; James Atlee Hunt, aged thirteen, son of Mr. Hunt, house agent, Southampton, late manager of the English Joint Stock Bank, Christchurch; and William Robert Smith, son of Mr. Smith, of the firm of Smith, Pumstead, and Trippe, drapers, Southampton. The place selected by the bathers was a little beyond where the rivers Stour and Avon join and empty themselves into the sea, just off a bar, or bank of sand. It was between three and half-past three p.m., and the tide was turning. The bathers, who, excepting Mr. Geyer, the tutor, could not swim, were in fancied security on a shifting sand, when a heavy wave came upon them, carried them into the deep water between the sand and the beach, and seven were drowned. None of the eight, as we have said, were able to swim, but Milne very fortunately succeeded in regaining the shore. "The wave," he said, "came and put us into deep water at once. It put me out of my depth; I saw the wave coming; it carried me forward towards the shore, taking me off my feet. As the wave left me I was able to walk, and walked out. The moment before the wave came to me I saw some of the others put up their hands, and one called for help. When I got out I saw nothing of them." Mr. Geyer exerted himself to the utmost, but he was unable to save more than his own life. He was swimming, and heard a cry of distress. Looking round, he saw the hands of one of the boys thrown up, and he swam to his assistance. Mr. Geyer tried to save the boy, but it was evidently impossible for him

to do so. He was exhausted by swimming, and the boy, terrified at the prospect of drowning, clung round his tutor's arms with such tenacity as to disable the swimmer for the moment, and bear him under the water. The boy, however, relinquished his hold and perished, and Mr. Geyer then swam ashore. The dead bodies of the seven boys were afterwards washed ashore.

At the inquest the jury returned a verdict of "Accidentally drowned," and wished to add a recommendation that a board should be placed on the beach at dangerous places to warn the public.

26. EXECUTION OF MICHAEL BARRETT.—Michael Barrett was hanged at Newgate for his share in the outrage committed at Clerkenwell prison on December 13, 1867, and narrated in our last volume.

He had been arrested at Glasgow (see "Chronicle" for January), and his execution was originally fixed for May 12, but in the meantime grave doubts were expressed in some quarters as to the justice of the conviction, and the result was that a respite of seven days was granted, and commissioners were despatched to Glasgow by the Home Office to thoroughly investigate the *alibi* which had been set up during his trial. The inquiries having been protracted longer than was contemplated, a second respite was granted, it being expressly stated at the same time in the communication made by Mr. Secretary Hardy, that the delay was solely for the purpose of affording an opportunity of inquiry into the *alibi* set up by the prisoner at his trial, and that if those inquiries turned out unfavourable, the sentence would certainly be carried into effect. The felon himself did not seem to be at all impressed with the idea that the result would be favourable to him, and he was evidently fully prepared for the communication that was made to him by a gentleman specially sent from the Home Office, to the effect that the result of the inquiries and the evidence that had been taken at Glasgow was that there was no truth in the defence that was set up, that he was at Glasgow on the day the outrage was committed; and that he must, consequently, be prepared to undergo the sentence of the law. The Government took very great pains to ascertain the truth, and there was not the slightest doubt that the evidence given at the trial to show that the prisoner was in Glasgow on the day of the explosion did not apply to him at all events, although it might possibly have referred to another individual.

This was the last public execution that will be seen in England, and it took place, we may say, amid the most complete apathy on the part of the London populace. It seemed on the previous night that the crowd to witness the hanging of Michael Barrett would be very large, for at eleven o'clock there were from 1500 to 1800 persons present, and the public-houses in the neighbourhood drove a roaring trade, some of their customers being about as unpleasant-looking scoundrels as ever gloated on the gallows.

There were very few women among them; and of these an unusually large proportion were young and bounnetless girls, who were obviously from the Emerald Isle, or one generation removed at the most. But even the uninteresting assemblage in the Old Bailey became still less numerous after the close of the public-houses. Instead of the throng within the slight barriers, which, as usual, intersected the space in front of the gaol, increasing when the gin-palaces closed, they seemed rather to diminish. There was no struggling for places; there were few, if any, ribald songs; there was no attempt at street preaching or improving the occasion; and there was less noise and less confusion than at almost any previous execution. As dawn broke over the Old Bailey the small crowd, numbering at the most no more than 2000, seemed to settle down permanently into their places; and from this time on there was remarkably little to note, either in the movements or the demeanour of the mob, until half-past six o'clock, at which time the numbers had perceptibly increased, though there was still easy passage under most of the barriers. From six o'clock the crowd, which might hitherto have been counted by hundreds, rapidly increased, and a large number of persons took up their places in the Old Bailey and at the end of Newgate-street. Nevertheless, the pressure never was great, and the demeanour of the spectators contrasted most favourably with former scenes around the scaffold. There was little noise or confusion, and very little of the ribaldry, drunkenness, and shocking levity which have furnished so potent an argument against public executions. The solitary street preacher who took up his place outside the barriers was listened to very quietly, and the tract distributors at the street corner gave away their stock of handbills without encountering jeering or blasphemy. The police never performed their duty with less difficulty. At half-past seven o'clock the first dull note of the solemn death-bell fell upon the ears of the assemblage, and at the same hour the sheriffs (Mr. Alderman Stone and Mr. M'Arthur) arrived, with the undersheriffs (Messrs. Davidson and Roche). Entering by the door in Amen-corner, they were received in the justices' room by the governor of the gaol. The convict, who was said to have passed a quiet night, had been called about an hour before; and at half-past seven the executioner went to the condemned cell, and performed the duty of pinioning, which was submitted to with great composure.

The scene in the street when the convict appeared was very different from what has been witnessed at previous executions. There was very little hustling or confusion, though there was some clapping of hands from a few in the crowd; and all hats were simultaneously removed. The sentiment of indignation and horror which the crime produced was forcibly expressed by those congregated in the vicinity of the gallows, who groaned and hooted vigorously for a moment. Then all was still as the wretched Barrett stood face to face with death. He looked down with calm face

upon the multitude, and the straps were adjusted upon his legs by Calcraft. His demeanour, without partaking of bravado, was remarkably firm, but he seemed perfectly sensible of his awful position. While the last preparations were being made, he held the hand of the Rev. Dr. Hussey, and joined quietly, but with much earnestness, in the fervent prayers for his departing soul. The wretched man did not seem to struggle much. His body slowly swung round once or twice, and then all was over. The crowd soon began to disperse, and the rush through the Old Bailey into Ludgate-hill intercepted the traffic for some minutes. Comparatively few persons remained near the gallows gazing at the lifeless body of the man who had just paid the penalty of one of the most horrible outrages ever committed in England. The body remained suspended for the usual time, when it was cut down by Calcraft.

It is impossible to say whether Barrett made any confession of his guilt. Some statements made to the Rev. Dr. Hussey were under the seal of the confessional, and the rev. gentleman felt himself unable to answer any question upon the subject. He stated, however, that the convict showed a truly penitent state of mind, that he gave the deepest attention to his religious exercises, and joined fervently in the efforts made to prepare him for his end. These expressions lead to the inference that the culprit admitted the crime. At any rate he had recently made no protestations of innocence. The prison officials said that his conduct was admirable, and those who witnessed the execution could not fail to be struck with the firmness he displayed in the last fearful scene of his life. The body was interred in the course of the day within the precincts of the prison.

27. EPSOM RACES. THE DERBY.—This Derby-day was rendered remarkable by the utter collapse of the favourite, Lady Elizabeth, and consequent discomfiture of the book-makers. The weather was all that could be wished. The Prince of Wales, accompanied by the Crown Prince of Denmark, the Duke of Cambridge, Prince Teck, and the Duke of Sutherland arrived shortly after two o'clock, and after proceeding to the paddock witnessed the race from a private stand.

The great event came off as follows:—

The Eighty-ninth Derby Stakes of 50 sovs. each, h. ft., for 3-yr.-olds; colts, 8st. 10lb.; fillies, 8st. 5lb.; the second to receive 100 sovs. out of the stakes. One mile and a half. 262 subs.

Sir J. Hawley's b. c. Blue Gown, by Beadsman (Wells)	1
Baron Rothschild's b. c. King Alfred (Norman)	2
Duke of Newcastle's b. c. Speculum (Kenyon)	3
Mr. Hodgman's br. c. Paul Jones (Parry)	0
Mr. Beadman's b. c. Orion (Clement)	0
Sir J. Hawley's b. f. Green Sleeve (J. Adams)	0

E

Sir J. Hawley's b. c. Rosicrucian (Custance)	0
Mr. Chaplin's ch. c. St. Ronan (Jeffery)	0
Marquis of Hastings' b. f. Lady Elizabeth (Fordham)	0
Lord Ailesbury's ch. f. Franchise (Challoner)	0
Sir L. Newman's b. c. The Forrest King (J. Snowden)	0
Mr. John Day's br. c. Cock of the Walk (H. Day)	0
Lord Glasgow's br. c. by Brother to Bird on the Wing (Cameron)	0
Mr. Padwick's ch. c. Samson (T. French)	0
Mr. J. Scott's b. c. Viscount (J. Osborne)	0
Colonel Pearson's ch. c. Cap-à-Pie (Grimshaw)	0
Lord Wilton's br. c. See-Saw (Maidment)	0
Baron Rothschild's br. c. Suffolk (J. Daley)	0

Betting—7 to 4 agst Lady Elizabeth, 100 to 30 agst Blue Gown, 8 to 1 agst Paul Jones, 10 to 1 agst Suffolk, 100 to 8 agst Speculum, 100 to 7 agst Orion, 25 to 1 agst Rosicrucian, 33 to 1 each agst Cap-à-Pie, Pace, and Green Sleeve, 40 to 1 agst See-Saw, 50 to 1 each agst St. Ronan and Forest King, 100 to 15 agst King Alfred, and 100 to 1 agst Franchise.

With little or no loss of time the toilets of the eighteen competitors assembled in the paddock were completed, Lady Elizabeth having gone through that performance at Mr. Sherward's, "The Warren." They then paraded past the Stand, and having reached the distance, they wheeled round, and commenced their preliminary canter, led by Paul Jones, Rosicrucian, Green Sleeve, and Blue Gown, several lengths in advance of Lord Glasgow's colt, Orion, Forest King, and the Baron's pair, a long way in whose rear came Franchise, the Duke of Newcastle's two, and Samson, each eliciting special remarks as they swept by. Pace, on nearing the enclosure, faltered in his stride, and immediately after Aldcroft was seen endeavouring to stop him, when it became apparent that he had broken down; and upon his rider dismounting and returning to the enclosure it was found that the back tendons of his off fore-leg had given way. This sensation, however, soon gave way to the more important business on hand, the progress of the others to the starting-post, which, having been reached, Mr. McGeorge speedily got them in order, and, with the exception of three or four failures occasioned by Lady Elizabeth refusing to join her horses, he despatched them in excellent time and close company. When fairly in their places the running was taken up by Cap-à-Pie, having Orion on his left, the pair being followed by Speculum, See-Saw, Blue Gown, Paul Jones, Franchise, King Alfred, and Green Sleeve in a body, the latter lying on the inside, pulling double. To these succeeded Suffolk, Rosicrucian, Forest King, and Cock of the Walk, heading the next division, in the rear of whom were seen the colours of Samson, Viscount, St. Ronan, and Lady Elizabeth. In

these positions they ran a quarter of a mile, when Orion headed Colonel Pearson's colt and assumed the command. Speculum, Blue Gown, and his stable companion, Green Sleeve, at the same time were seen gradually nearing the front, followed by Paul Jones and St. Ronan, the latter having quitted his rearward position, which was still occupied by Viscount, Samson, and Lady Elizabeth, the favourite at this early period of the race appearing unable to act, and as they came through the "bushes," Fordham, to the alarm of her backers, was seen "hard upon her," but without mending her position, and as they reached the mile post she was hopelessly out of the race, so far as any chance she now possessed. Orion still held his prominent position in the van as they descended the hill, Cap-à-Pie lying second, Blue Gown third, King Alfred fourth, with Speculum, Franchise, Paul Jones, Green Sleeve, and St. Ronan close in their track; then followed Rosicrucian, Suffolk, and See-Saw; but on rounding Tattenham-corner the lot closed up and ran in company into the straight, where the two leaders were beaten and suddenly disappeared from the van, the colours of Green Sleeve and Rosicrucian at the same time fading away. The running, through these withdrawals, was left with King Alfred on the lower ground, having Blue Gown in the centre, on the right of whom came Speculum, Paul Jones, See-Saw, St. Ronan, and Suffolk. Franchise, who up to this point had been running in a forward position, suddenly collapsed on crossing the road, and immediately after Chalfoner was seen to dismount, he having ascertained that she had broken her leg badly. At the distance Paul Jones and See-Saw were added to the beaten division, and the issue was now left with the Baron's outsider, King Alfred, and Blue Gown, the contest being watched with the most feverish excitement by the thousands committed to the Judge's fiat. Half-way up the former appeared to have the best of it, when loud shouts from the ring of "The Baron wins," which were repeated from the hill-side and the Stands, but they had scarcely been raised when a counter-cheer for Sir Joseph arose, and shortly after Wells was seen quietly creeping up, and, catching King Alfred (who stopped to nothing) at the Stand, won a fine race by half a length, very cleverly. Speculum finished a bad third, St. Ronan fourth, Rosicrucian fifth, Suffolk sixth, Orion seventh, Paul Jones eighth, Green Sleeve ninth. Then came, at wide intervals, Lord Glasgow's colt, See-Saw, Cap-à-Pie, and the favourite. A long interval separated these from Forest King, who did not pass the post. Viscount and Franchise walked in with the crowd. Net value of the stakes, 6876*l*. The time, as taken by Benson's chronograph, was two minutes, forty-three seconds and a half.

29. THE OAKS DAY.—This great race was as follows:—

Ninetieth Oaks Stakes of 50 sovs. each, h. ft., for 3-yr.-old fillies, 8st. 10lb. each; the second received 100 sovs. One mile and a half. New Course. 215 subs.

Mr. G. Jones's ch. Formosa, by Buccaneer (G. Fordham)	1
Mr. M. Dawson's ch. Lady Coventry (Daley)	2
Mr. Padwick's ch. Athena (T. French)	3
Marquis of Hastings' b. Lady Elizabeth (Cannon)	0
Mr. G. Jones's ch. Janet Rawcliffe (C. Page)	0
Duke of Hamilton's ch. Léonie (Aldcroft)	0
Mr. W. Davis's ch. Fair Star (Grimshaw)	0
Mr. G. Holmes's br. Virtue (Snowden)	0
Mr. Welsby's Curfew Bell (J. Osborne)	0

Betting—11 to 8 on Formosa, 9 to 2 agst Lady Elizabeth, 8 to 1 agst Virtue, and 12 to 1 each agst Léonie and Lady Coventry.

The precautions taken on the Derby-day were again had recourse to, as to the saddling of Lady Elizabeth and her stable companion, Athena; but on this occasion the "British public" were indulged with a preliminary canter, which, however, did not appear to raise the hopes of her ladyship's backers. On the other hand, the free action and sweeping stride of the beautiful daughter of Buccaneer appeared to arrest the attention of all. Shortly afterwards they were seen to emerge from the paddock, headed by Martin Starling, and he having handed them over to the safe keeping of the starter, all eyes were centered upon the valley, where they were marshalled in close order. To the surprise of all a start was effected at the first attempt, and shortly after Janet Rawcliffe was driven to the front, and came on with the running at her best pace, evidently to serve the favourite; but so wretched was the attempt, that Fordham, relying upon his own resources, headed her half-way into the "furzes," and assumed the command, having in his wake Fair Star, Léonie, Curfew Bell, Virtue, and Lady Coventry; then followed Janet Rawcliffe, Lady Elizabeth, and Athena to the old mile post. Here Cannon somewhat improved his position, but when fairly on the hill he was headed by Athena, who as they gradually descended the hill mended her position. When fairly round Tattenham-corner, Virtue, on the lower side, took second place, the three immediate followers of the favourite evidently having had enough of it, and being passed by Athena and Lady Coventry. Lady Elizabeth even at this early period was out of it. As they crossed the road, Virtue for a short time exhibited some vitality, but on reaching the distance she gave way, and Athena became the immediate follower of the favourite, with Lady Coventry—whom Daley had been riding from the start—third. Half-way up Fordham was seen to indulge Formosa with a pull, and, looking round to place his followers, he then with a quiet smile resumed the even tenour of his way, the favourite passing the post in a "water canter," ten lengths in advance of Lady Coventry, who ran past the pulling-up Athena at the stand; Fair Star just headed Virtue on the post for

fourth place, Curfew Bell pulling up fifth, with Lady Elizabeth a long way in her rear; Janet Rawcliffe and Léonie were the last two. The race was run in two minutes, forty-seven seconds and a quarter.

30. THE HORSE SHOW AT ISLINGTON.—According to what has now become an annual custom, the Agricultural Hall at Islington opened for the fifth show of horses, and the collection might fairly be pronounced better as well as larger than any of its predecessors. Altogether, there were upwards of 350 horses competing; about 130 of them were hunters, including a good show of weight-carriers, 114 park hacks and ladies' horses, a few cover hacks and roadsters, and about a score of harness horses; the stallions were not numerous, but made a good show as regards quality; and some forty or fifty ponies attracted a good deal of attention in their stalls. Among these was Kaplan, the grey Arab stallion presented to the Prince of Wales by the Sultan; the Prince also sent his old favourite Arab mare Rupee and the Knight of St. Patrick, which took a prize in the second class of hunters. The arrangements corresponded generally with those of last year, the competition was conducted with good order, and, surprising to state, the ventilation was so thorough that it was hard to believe when standing by the ring that you were surrounded by nearly 400 loose boxes, each with its horse and all the paraphernalia of the stable.

The first class judged comprised weight-carrying hunters equal to not less than fifteen stone. Fifty horses entered, and all but one put in an appearance. The first prize of 80*l.* in this class was given to Mountain Dew, a black-brown six-year-old, belonging to Captain Heygate, of Leominster; he was a light-made horse for fifteen stone, but well proportioned; he refused the hedge several times, but went over once or twice in remarkably good style. The second prize, of 40*l.*, was given to Tyrconnell, a six-year-old bay, belonging to Miss Fyler, of Wareham. This horse was even lighter in build than Mountain Dew. The third prize of 20*l.* fell to Borderer, a powerful five-year-old bay, standing 16 hands 1½ inches. He was a large-boned horse; and, although of undoubted strength, he wanted the symmetry possessed by several of the rejected competitors, his equals in most respects.

The second class of hunters, entered without condition as to weight, comprised a number of very superior horses, and, as a whole, might, without doubt, be pronounced a great advance in quality on the same class of last year. The judges even affirmed they never saw so good a collection any where. Fourteen were selected out of the total of 49. There was no question about the winner of the first prize, of 50*l.*, in this class; it was given with universal approbation to Lady Derwent, a bay mare, belonging to Mr. Hornby, of Ganton, Yorkshire, and bred by Mr. Cordiner, of Hesterton. She stood 15 hands 3 inches, and was the most perfect combination of strength, symmetry, and

graceful action competed with. We may mention here that Lady Derwent also took the 25 guinea gold medal as the best among the winners of first prizes in the four classes of hunters. Respecting the second prize, the judges hesitated long between the Prince of Wales's Knight of St. Patrick and a five-year-old chestnut named The General, owned by Mr. Gee, of Wadhurst. The Knight of St. Patrick, also a five-year chestnut, was 16 hands high, a sleek, and, as a rule, a quiet horse; he was, however, inclined to clumsiness in the hind quarters. The General was more up to the mark as regards symmetry, and seemed made for speed; he also jumped well. The judges had the two horses stripped before deciding, and at last gave the second, or 25*l.*, prize to the Knight, and the the third, or 15*l.*, to the General. The Prince's horse was bred by Mr. Colgan, of Kilcock. Class 3 consisted of hunters under 15½ hands high. The competitors numbered 23, and the first prize of 40*l.* fell to Chillon, a five-year-old gelding owned by Mr. Casson, of Carlisle; the second prize, of 20*l.*, was taken by Nutbourne, a fine chestnut belonging to Mr. William Jones Lloyd, of Watford. Chillon was a handsome horse, but unfortunately he always refused the fence, so his jumping qualities had to be imagined. The first prize of 50*l.* for four-year-old hunters, Class 4, was given to Lord Somerville's Nugentstown, and the second prize of 25*l.* to Brigadier, owned by Mr. Booth, of Catterick, York. Nugentstown caused some amusement by coolly lying down, to the surprise of his rider, while the eyes of the judges were still upon him.

The four classes we have noticed, and two classes of stallions, 13 and 14, were judged by the Earl of Macclesfield and Lords Combermere and Kesteven.

On the 3rd of June the Prince and Princess of Wales honoured the Horse Show with a visit, and a full hall welcomed them with many rounds of cheers. Their Royal Highnesses were accompanied by the Crown Prince of Denmark and Prince Christian, and attending on them were Lady Westmoreland, Lady Macclesfield, and Lady Suffield, Lord Hamilton, M.P., and Colonel Kingscote, M.P. The Royal party drove within the hall shortly before five o'clock; they were received by Mr. Clayden, Mr. Shuttleworth, Mr. Leeds, Mr. Giblett, and Mr. Comfort, and were conducted to a private box overlooking the ring, where Mr. Sidney, the secretary, directed the entertainment during the hour and a half their Royal Highnesses stayed. First the prize horses were paraded, commencing with the harness pairs and the stallions; and when the qualities of Rapid Roan and Fire-away Shales had been exhibited, the ring was given up to a remarkable trotter, named Telegraph, driven in a fragile carriage known as "an American machine." Next the park hacks and ladies' horses passed in review, and among them an old grey charger, named Napier, attracted every eye by the execution of a kind of goose step before the Royal box. Then the hunters appeared, headed by Lady Derwent, the winner of the

Gold Medal; the fences were set up and a scene of the greatest animation ensued. The Royal party left the hall at a quarter-past six.

On the 5th the show was brought to a close by the award of prizes for trotting and leaping. Prince Teck was among the visitors.

The uniform success of this Show, although still in its childhood, has excited the curiosity of the Société Hippique Française. This association, headed by the Emperor himself, and boasting among its members some most distinguished Frenchmen, has projected shows on two occasions, but from various causes, and principally, the association itself believes, from defective management, they have failed. Accordingly, two of its members—Le Vicomte de Mortemart and Le Comte de Mornay-Soult—were commissioned to attend the Show at Islington to see how things were managed there. They expressed surprise at the simplicity of the arrangements at the Agricultural Hall, and especially at the homely way in which the judges went about their work; they hoped with the information they had gained, to make their Show next April somewhat of a success.

JUNE.

11. ASCOT RACES. THE CUP DAY.—The attendance at this favourite meeting was very numerous and the weather was all that could be desired. Before twelve o'clock the lawn was hidden with kaleidoscopic changes of colour, and the space along the ropes was filled with drags and carriages, but the gaiety and animation of the scene culminated at half-past one, when the scarlet liveries of the outriders who attended the royal party were seen moving slowly amidst the multitude about half a mile from the Stand. Presently the Prince and Princess of Wales arrived, and were received with deafening applause. In the same carriage with their Royal Highnesses were the Crown Prince of Denmark and the Princess Christian. In a second carriage were Princess Teck, the Duke of Cambridge, Lady Bingham, and Prince Christian, and a third was occupied by Prince Teck, the Duke of Sutherland, and the Countess Spencer. The cheering was renewed when the royal visitors had been conducted to the places prepared for them.

And the cause of the gathering was the running, if we accept the Derby as the criterion, of the three best horses of the year. Blue Gown, King Alfred, and Speculum finished one, two, three on the last Wednesday in May, and were here to fight their battle over again on a severer course, and before nearly as enthusiastic an assemblage. A falling off in numbers, but for the interest and

the quality of the three competitors worthy to take rank with past contests. A parade in the Royal Enclosure is part and parcel of the Cup programme, and, though shorn of its glories by the small field, it was with the usual pomp and circumstance that the Clerk of the Course ushered in Speculum, Blue Gown, and King Alfred to the distinguished visitors. They were not quite in their Epsom bloom, and perhaps Speculum looked the best of the trio, Blue Gown being thought by some judges to go rather short, and King Alfred having that high action which did not look like staying. Blue Gown was the favourite, as a Derby winner should be.

The following is the account of the race :—

The GOLD CUP, value 300 sovs., given from the Fund, and added to a subscription of 20 sovs. each; the owner of the second horse to receive 50 sovs. out of the stakes; 3-yr-olds, 7st. 5lb.; 4-yr-olds, 8st. 10lb.; 5-yr-olds, 9st. 3lb.; 6-yr-olds, 9st. 5lb.; mares and geldings allowed 3lb. To start at the Cup post and go once round, about two miles and a half. 22 subs.

Sir J. Hawley's Blue Gown, by Beadsman, 3 yrs.	
7st. 5lb. (Cameron)	1
* Duke of Newcastle's Speculum, 3 yrs. 7st. 5lb.	
(Kenyon)	2
Baron Rothschild's King Alfred, 3 yrs. 7st. 5lb.	
(Peake)	3

Betting—6 to 4 on Blue Gown, 2 to 1 agst King Alfred, and 6 to 1 agst Speculum.

Prior to taking their preliminary canters the favourite and King Alfred evinced temper, and for some seconds refused to obey the dictates of their riders. At last they were got round and joined Speculum at the distance, and they commenced their introductory gallops, in which exception was taken to the going of Blue Gown, who appeared to go short. When fairly away Blue Gown took a slight lead of Speculum, King Alfred lying a length or so in their rear to the Stand, where Speculum, over-pulling Kenyon, headed the favourite, and led down the Swinley-hill, by a couple of lengths; King Alfred at the same time gradually nearing Sir Joseph's colt as they proceeded along the lower ground, the pace mending at the same time. When fairly round the brickkilns turn the three closed and ran together to the entrance into the straight, where Blue Gown, on the inside, headed Speculum and came on with a clear lead, which he increased as he came on, and won, amid loud shouts from stand and ring, by four lengths. Half that distance separated the Duke's colt and King Alfred, the latter pulling up dreadfully leg weary. Time, as taken by Benson's chronograph, four minutes, thirty-eight seconds and a quarter.

15. THE HANDEL TRIENNIAL FESTIVAL.—This great musical festival was held with extraordinary success at the Crystal Palace. The weather was propitious; multitudes flocked together from all parts of the United Kingdom and from many parts of the

Continent; and the result was a commemoration of the mighty master which, in artistic grandeur and beauty, has never been equalled.

The solo vocalists were Mdme. Titien, Mdle. Nilsson, Mdme. Kellogg, Mdme. Rudersdorf, Mdle. Carola, Mdme. Lemmens-Sherington, Mdme. Sainton Dolby, Mr. Sims Reeves, Mr. Cummings, Signor Foli, Mr. Santley—names which were sufficient guarantee for the excellence that crowned their efforts. The orchestra was selected from musical institutions and cathedral choirs throughout the country and from various parts of the Continent. The instrumental band numbered 420 performers. There were 2200 metropolitan chorus singers and 1200 country singers, making a grand total (besides solo singers) of 3820.

The Festival commenced at two o'clock with a truly magnificent performance of the magnificent "Messiah." It was preceded by the National Anthem, during which the vast audience, considerably upwards of 15,000 in number, respectfully stood up, and as respectfully sat down at the conclusion, without giving utterance to any of the obstreperous demonstrations that used so frequently to denote the satisfaction of all hearers at its performance. On the 17th miscellaneous selections from the Messiah were performed, and on the 19th the festival was brought to a close by the performance of the famous "Israel in Egypt," which was listened to by a brilliant company of nearly 20,000.

This, the third and last performance, was decidedly the best of all. The day of "Israel in Egypt" has, from the commencement, been the day of the Handel Festival; and so it proved on this occasion. The weather was splendid, the crowd was enormous, and the performance was unparalleled. The oratorio was preceded by the overture to the "Occasional Oratorio," the brilliant performance of which, by the orchestra of 500 players, made even a stronger impression than at the miscellaneous selection on the 17th. Nothing could have been more appropriately chosen. Then followed the "Israel in Egypt," which from first to last was almost without a flaw. But at this Festival, as at every Handel Festival that has been held, beginning with the bold experiment in 1857, the sensation of the week was produced by "The enemy said, 'I will pursue, I will overtake,' &c.," an air which Mr. Sims Reeves has made his own, and which to sing after him would be an ungrateful task for any other living tenor. This superb air was, if possible, sung by Mr. Reeves more magnificently than on any previous occasion—magnificently as he has so often sung it. He gave it, indeed, with a power of voice, a vigorous accent, a truth of intonation, a fluency, sustained from end to end, a fire and an enthusiasm which has never been excelled. Every phrase had its well-expressed meaning; every note told—even in the most rapid enunciation of "*bravura*" passages. Its effect was literally "electrical," and at the end a storm of applause broke out from every part of the building, in which the singers and players in the orchestra unanimously

joined. To resist the "encore" under such circumstances was impossible, even for Mr. Reeves, the avowed enemy of encores, and the ~~air~~ was repeated with the same power and unflagging animation as before. A more marked impression was never produced by a solo performance. The 20,000 rose at Mr. Reeves, as the pit, according to Edmund Kean, on some memorable occasion, rose at Edmund Kean.

At the end of the oratorio, as at previous commemorations, the National Anthem was given (by chorus and orchestra—precisely as it was given on the first day). Then there was a loud and universal cry of "Costa," to which the indomitable conductor of the Handel Festival responded by repeated bows, retiring amid applause that seemed as though it would never cease. Mr. Bowley, too, the energetic general manager of the Crystal Palace, to whom the organization of these triennial gatherings is principally due, was loudly called for, but though he might gracefully have done so, he made no appearance.

The total number of visitors to the Palace during the Festival was 82,465. In 1865 the numbers were 59,434.

16. MR. LONGFELLOW AT CAMBRIDGE.—It having been proposed to confer the degree of Honorary Doctor of Laws upon Mr. Longfellow, the popular American poet, who a few days previously had landed upon our shores, the ceremony took place before the customary recitation of the prize exercises. The floor of the Senate House was crowded by all who had the privilege of admittance there, and it being "scarlet day," a most brilliant display was presented. The undergraduates thronged the galleries, and favoured Mr. Longfellow with a literal triumph: The Vice-Chancellor (the Rev. the Master of Trinity) presided, and shortly after two o'clock Mr. Longfellow entered upon the dais from the doctors' entrance amid cheering from the galleries again and again renewed. There was very little of the interruption from the galleries that has previously taken place; in fact, the undergraduates behaved very well. The Public Orator presented Mr. Longfellow for his degree amid ringing cheers from the galleries. Mr. Orator made a Latin oration in Mr. Longfellow's honour, which elicited great applause. The degree of honorary LL.D. was then conferred on Mr. Longfellow, after which Dr. Longfellow took a seat upon the dais among some of the most distinguished members of the University present, and was the cynosure of all eyes till the close of the proceedings. The recitation of the prize exercises was then proceeded with.

17. THE PRINCE OF WALES AND THE CROWN PRINCE OF DENMARK AT OXFORD.—The commemoration festivities took place with their usual éclat, but this day's proceedings were more than ordinarily brilliant, owing to its being known that an honorary degree was to be conferred upon the Crown Prince of Denmark, and that he would be accompanied by the Prince of Wales. The unexpected presence of royalty, combined with the splendid

weather, drew together a great company, by no means composed exclusively of University men and their immediate friends. The Prince of Wales and the Crown Prince of Denmark arrived at half-past ten o'clock. Their Royal Highnesses went in procession from the Vice-Chancellor's to the Sheldonian Theatre, where they were received with great enthusiasm. The diploma conferring the degree of D.C.L. was presented by the Vice-Chancellor to the Crown Prince of Denmark; and afterwards the degree of D.C.L. was conferred on Dr. Salmon, Dr. Miller, and Mr. Whitworth. Mr. Longfellow, who had been expected, was absent. A large number of undergraduates were present, and the usual cries were indulged in by them. Governor Eyre had the sympathy of the whole body, cheer after cheer being given when his name was mentioned, and inquiries made for him when the honorary degrees were conferred. The Creweian oration and the prizes were delivered in the theatre as usual.

19. PRINCE ARTHUR AT WOOLWICH.—This day being fixed for the distribution of prizes to the gentlemen cadets at the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich, Prince and Princess Christian arrived at a few minutes before eleven a.m., and were soon followed by Field Marshal the Duke of Cambridge. The company of gentlemen cadets was formed on parade, and received the Commander-in-Chief with a general salute. After being inspected, the line broke into open column of companies and marched past, Prince Arthur leading. They then marched past in quick time in grand divisions. Prince Arthur was then called to the front to drill the company of gentlemen cadets, and executed a few battalion movements. The distribution of prizes was then made. The Pollock medal was first delivered, it being handed to the winner by General Sir George Pollock. The other prizes were distributed by the Duke of Cambridge, who addressed the cadets, stating that it was very gratifying to him to be able to speak of the general good conduct of the cadets, and to find that the observations he had made to them when Prince Arthur was about to join the Academy had been attended to. The Duke then presented Prince Arthur with his commission as an officer of the Royal Engineers, on the part of her Majesty, and spoke very highly of his general good conduct and diligent attention to his studies during the time he had been at the Academy. Prince Arthur's appointment as Lieutenant appeared in the *Gazette* in the evening.

20. ROYAL VOLUNTEER REVIEW AT WINDSOR.—The review of 27,000 volunteers by her Majesty the Queen in Windsor Park was executed with complete success. The day was kept as a holiday in most of the public offices and large business establishments of London; and in many parts of the City the streets that morning had quite a military aspect.

The town of Windsor wore a very unusual appearance. The shops were shut, while the taverns and hotels were thronged;

flags of all colours hung from the windows of the principal houses ; words of welcome and emblematic devices were displayed in prominent places ; crowds gathered at the railway stations to give the visitors a warm reception, and their frequent cheering mingled with the confused noise of various tunes as the regiments marched under the castle walls to the gates of the Royal Park, each preceded by its band.

The arrangements made for the review in the Great Park were very convenient. The spectators were chiefly confined to Queen Anne's Ride, and the horses were removed from the carriages, which were placed together, so as to take up as little space as possible. These regulations were supplemented by others issued by the Mayor, Mr. Wellman, which secured a free passage for the volunteers. Thus the carriage-road between Datchet and Datchet-lane was closed until the volunteers had passed into the Home Park, and the Long Walk was devoted solely to Volunteers, save while her Majesty's cortège was passing from the castle to the park. It was owing to the admirable way in which these regulations were carried out, and to the care taken that the various corps should know their respective positions, that no confusion prevailed, no accident happened, and the disposition of the troops was completely successful.

Queen Anne's Mead, that fine expanse of two or three hundred acres, on which the review took place, was kept clear by the Metropolitan Police, under Sir Richard Mayne, who received effectual assistance from the 17th Lancers. This part of the Great Park, the ground of which has a slight incline, is situated between the Long Walk and Queen Anne's Ride. It extends almost to the statue of George III., which stands on a little mound called Snow-hill. The same spot was selected for the review of the regular troops and the Household Brigade during the visit of the Emperor Napoleon to the Queen. The ground was sufficiently marked out by the splendid trees with which it is bordered ; but, in order to preserve it from intrusion, stakes and chains were placed for nearly a mile from Queen Anne's gate. Behind this line the spectators took up their position, certain enclosures being made near the saluting flag for the convenience of titled ladies, officers in uniform, and other visitors ; also for the reporters of the various journals. The ground was kept by the 1st Regiment of Life Guards, commanded by Colonel the Hon. Dudley F. De Ros ; the first battalion Coldstream Guards, under the command of Colonel Dudley Carleton ; the 10th (Prince of Wales's) Hussars, by Colonel Baker ; and the 17th Lancers, Colonel Balders. The Hussars marched over from Aldershot and the Lancers from Woolwich ; they returned to Ascot after the review and encamped till Monday. In the ample space which was found for all the thousands who came to witness the review, general quiet seemed to prevail during the hour or two of waiting which preceded the

arrival of the royal party. It was relieved by the music of the band of the 1st Life Guards.

One of the incidents of the day was the construction of the pontoon-bridge at Datchet by a detachment of Royal Engineers from Aldershot. The object of this was to enable about one-third of the volunteer regiments to reach their place of rendezvous by the shortest route, and to lessen the confusion incident to the progress of many thousand men through Windsor. At eleven o'clock her Majesty, with Princesses Louisa and Beatrice, reached Datchet in an open carriage, and immediately afterwards the construction of the bridge was begun. So rapidly was the work accomplished, that a bridge 218 feet in length was placed across the Thames in twenty-eight minutes, and at noon was crossed by the 2nd Essex Administrative Battalion, which was the first regiment to arrive at Datchet station. In the presence of her Majesty this corps marched across the first pontoon-bridge ever placed across the Thames for the passage of volunteers. When they reached the Windsor side of the river the men gave a cheer for the Queen, which was heartily joined in by the spectators. The royal party remained for about half an hour watching the successive corps that arrived at Datchet. The bridge was marched across in formation of fours, and, notwithstanding the immense weight which it had to bear, very little oscillation was observable.

At half-past three o'clock the gun was fired which gave the signal for the regiments to get under arms, before moving into their position on the review ground. This signal immediately emptied the refreshment-tents, and with commendable alacrity the men obeyed the order, the London Irish being among the first to take up their position. At four o'clock the whole scene had assumed a new aspect. The troops were drawn up in two lines, the first and second brigades of infantry forming the first, and the third and fourth the second line, with the cavalry on the right and the artillery on the left. The contrast of colours was very pretty, and even striking. Here and there a long streak of light grey lay between dark green and bright scarlet, and though grey and green and russet predominated, there was a pleasing relief of stronger colours, which could not have been more agreeable if the regiments had been arranged with a view to effect. The elms of the Long Walk formed a fine background to the picture, and the volunteers stood facing Queen Anne's Ride, where the noble trees sheltered the majority of the spectators from the intense sunlight. On the right of the flagstaff were erected two large stands, one of which had been specially set apart for Etonians and their friends. The other was occupied by several hundred ladies. On each side of the stand were long lines of carriages and drags, carefully marshalled by the police. Her Majesty did not appear until an hour later than the time fixed, but the cause of this change in the arrangements was the delay in the arrival of several corps by the

South-Western Railway. It was five o'clock when the sudden appearance of a blaze of scarlet at the right of the line, and the report of the first gun of the salute told the spectators that the Queen had reached the review ground. The royal cortége, preceded by an escort of Life Guards, moved slowly towards the stand amidst the cheers of the people. His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge rode behind the staff, followed by Prince Christian, Prince Louis of Hesse, Prince Teck, and the Crown Prince of Denmark, also on horseback. The royal carriage was occupied by her Majesty, the Princess of Wales, Princess Louis of Hesse, and Princess Christian. On the right rode the Prince of Wales, and on the left Prince Arthur Patrick, the latter wearing the uniform of a lieutenant in the Royal Engineers. In the second carriage were Princess Louisa, Princess Beatrice, Prince Leopold, Princess Mary of Cambridge, and the youthful Princess Victoria of Hesse. Two other carriages were occupied by the ladies and gentlemen in waiting. The appearance of the royal party at the flagstaff was the signal for a cheer, which her Majesty, who seemed in excellent health and spirits, graciously acknowledged.

Her Majesty did not remain at the saluting-point, but, making a sweeping détour, arrived at the extreme point of the line of corps, and passed, with the carriages and horsemen of her suite, first along the outer and then between the outer and the inner line. She returned then to the saluting-point, receiving the greetings of the crowd. The two lines had been formed in quarter-distance column on the right of the royal carriages; and the bands of the 17th Lancers, the Hon. Artillery Company, the London Irish, and the London Brigade, being selected for their excellence, were in front of the flagstaff when the marching past commenced.

The cavalry and the batteries of artillery went past very well indeed, and the companies of artillery forming the first brigade did so well that they threw into the shade many of those who came after them. In the second brigade the 1st London Engineers and the South Kensington Engineers, for their bearing and marching, were especially noticed. The third brigade was headed by the Hon. Artillery Company, in front of whom rode the Prince of Wales, who wore his uniform as their Captain-General. They received the first token of applause, which was divided between them and the Eton boys, whose numbers were swelled by two companies from Harrow School and a few also from Rugby and Winchester. The marching of these boys, their steady appearance, and their neat uniforms, were much admired by the spectators. The Civil Service companies and the companies of "the Artists" were up to the mark. In the first brigade, second division, the Victorias and the 2nd Middlesex did remarkably well; but neither so well as the 1st Notts or Robin Hoods, who, as strangers, were much applauded, and who were, so far as marching was concerned, the crack regiment of the day. The 1st Surrey and the London

Irish came together, preceded by the Working Men's and followed by the 3rd City, in the second brigade, second division, and all did well; and in the second brigade, third division, the St. George's showed to most advantage. In the second brigade, fourth division, nearly all the corps marched evenly, the best being the Queen's and the Inns of Court, who were to have been, but were not, accompanied by a detachment from the Oxford University Battalion. The London Scottish and the London Brigade, which was headed by its Colonel, the Duke of Cambridge, did very well indeed in the rear brigade; but the new corps raised by Colonel Du Plat Taylor, and almost entirely composed of postmen and letter-carriers, was most worthy of notice—not merely because they were well set up, but because, though formed only a few months, they marched past with a spirit and with an evenness most creditable to their instructors.

The marching past finished at seven o'clock. It was followed by some manœuvres of the nature of a sham fight, under the direction of General Sir James Scarlett, which were supposed to represent an attack on Windsor, that town being defended by an imaginary force on the other side. There was a cavalry charge, and a good deal of skirmishing, followed by movements of the troops, in two lines, advancing to the attack; much firing of musketry, and of the field-guns, and a successful attempt to turn the left flank of the invisible defenders. The Queen then left the ground amidst the hearty cheers of all, and the volunteers marched off, for the most part to the railway stations, whence they were conveyed, not without some difficulties and delays, back to London.

26. ARRIVAL OF THE DUKE OF EDINBURGH.—The screw-frigate "Galatea," Captain his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, arrived at Spithead from Australia. On anchoring, she exchanged the customary salutes with the "Victory," flagship of the Commander-in-Chief, Admiral Sir T. S. Pasley, Bart. The "Sprightly," screw-tender, Master-Commander Allen, shortly afterwards proceeded to Spithead, to embark the Duke, who immediately landed at the King's Stairs to pay his respects to the Commander-in-Chief. His Royal Highness was received and heartily welcomed upon landing by a large number of naval officers. The disembarkation was without ceremony, the Duke being received only as a captain in her Majesty's navy. His Royal Highness looked well, and appeared to have quite recovered from the attack made upon him. After the official interview with the Commander-in-Chief, the Duke was conducted to the drawing room of Sir Thomas Pasley's residence, where were assembled the ex-Mayor (acting for the Mayor, who was absent from Portsmouth), and various civic authorities of the borough. The ex-Mayor presented an address to his Royal Highness, to which the Duke made a brief reply. His Royal Highness afterwards left the Admiralty House and re-embarked in the "Sprightly," and returned to the "Galatea," whence, after taking leave of the officers, the Duke proceeded in

the "Sprightly" to Southsea Pier, where he was received by the directors and by a large assemblage of people, who enthusiastically greeted him. His Royal Highness left Portsmouth by the six p.m. train of the Brighton and South Coast Railway, and was received upon his arrival in London by the Prince of Wales and Prince Louis of Hesse. Their Royal Highnesses drove to Clarence House. The Duke dined with the Prince and Princess of Wales at Marlborough House, and afterwards, accompanied by Prince Louis of Hesse, proceeded by special train, via the Great Western Railway, to Windsor, arriving at a quarter to eleven. His Royal Highness was received at the station by the Vicar and the Mayor of Windsor, and a large concourse of people were assembled, who welcomed the Duke with every demonstration of joy. The Queen, with the members of the Royal Family and the ladies and gentlemen in waiting, received his Royal Highness at the entrance to the castle.

27. THE COBDEN MEMORIAL IN CAMDEN TOWN.—The statue of the late Mr. Cobden, erected by subscription in the parish of St. Pancras, was publicly unveiled. It stands on the site of the old turnpike-gate, removed two years ago, at the lower end of High-street, Camden Town, in the neighbourhood of Mornington-crescent and Oakley-square, about half a mile north of the Euston-square Railway Terminus. The sculptors are Messrs. W. J. and T. Wills, of 101, Euston-road, who have produced a creditable work of art. The statue itself is carved of Sicilian marble, and is eight feet in height, representing Mr. Cobden in his ordinary dress, and in his accustomed attitude when speaking. One hand is outstretched, with raised forefinger; the other holds a scroll of paper. The statue is placed on a pedestal of Portland stone, fifteen feet high, the sides of which are sculptured in relief with fruits and sheaves of corn, symbolical of the plenty bestowed upon us by free trade legislation. The ceremony took place at four o'clock. Mrs. Cobden and her daughters, with other ladies, were in the balcony or at the windows of Milbrook House, at the corner of Harrington-square, to see the statue uncovered. The speakers occupied a platform in front of the statue—the two members for the borough of Marylebone, Mr. Harvey Lewis and Mr. Thomas Chambers, taking the chief part in the proceedings, with Mr. Henry Vincent and Mr. Ross. It was the last-named gentleman who, on behalf of the committee of subscribers, presented the statue to the parish authorities. The band of the 29th (North Middlesex) Rifle Volunteers was in attendance.

JULY.

1. BANQUET TO MR. CYRUS FIELD.—Mr. Cyrus Field was entertained at a public dinner at Willis's Rooms. The Duke of Argyll presided, and was supported by a distinguished company of noblemen and gentlemen, numbering more than 300. The interest of the proceedings was greatly enhanced by the transmission of messages to and from the United States and Canada during the progress of the banquet. To the President of the United States the Duke of Argyll sent the following:—"I am now surrounded by upwards of 300 gentlemen and many ladies, who have assembled to do honour to Mr. Cyrus Field, for his acknowledged exertions in promoting telegraphic communication between the New and Old World. It bids fair for the kindly influence of the Atlantic cable that its success should have brought together so friendly a gathering; and, in asking you to join our toast of 'Long life, health, and happiness' to your most worthy countryman, let me add a Highlander's wish that England and America may always be found, in peace and in war, 'shoulder to shoulder.'" Messages were also forwarded to Lord Monck, Governor-General of Canada; the Governor-General of Cuba, Havannah; the Governor of Victoria, Vancouver Island; the Governor of Newfoundland, and to Miss Mary Grace Field and Brothers, at New York; and to most of these messages answers were received. The chairman proposed the health of Mr. Field in an admirable speech, and that gentleman made a felicitous reply, which was greatly applauded. Sir John Pakington and Admiral Milne responded for the services of the two countries. Sir Stafford Northcote proposed the international toast of the evening, "The Peace and Prosperity of England and America," and Mr. Bright responded in an eloquent speech, in which he designated Mr. Field the Columbus of the nineteenth century. The remaining toasts were spoken to by Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, Mr. Parke Godwin, the Earl of Morley, M. de Lesseps, and Mr. John Horatio Lloyd. The demonstration was a brilliant success.

4. CRYSTAL PALACE FESTIVAL TO WELCOME PRINCE ALFRED.—The safe return of his Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh from his voyage to the Australian colonies, with his escape from the attempt to assassinate him in New South Wales, being a fit subject of popular rejoicing, the Crystal Palace Company arranged a grand festival, at which not only he was present, but the Prince of Wales also; and her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales came at a later hour of the evening. The entertainments consisted of a grand opera concert, the exhibition of the great fountains, and a magnificent display of fireworks at ten o'clock.

The royal visitors, with their company, were accommodated in three boxes, elegantly fitted up, in that part of the central transept which is opposite the Handel orchestra, and which was lately occupied by a theatre. The two Princes arrived at four o'clock, their party including the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, Prince Edward of Saxe-Weimar, the Duke of Sutherland, the Duke and Duchess of Manchester, the Marchioness of Aylesbury, the Countess of Westmoreland, and other ladies and gentlemen. The floor of the central transept, with the space near it on each side, was crowded with people, who greeted the Duke of Edinburgh and the Prince of Wales with a loud demonstration of welcome. The performance at the concert was a selection of opera music, in which Mario, Adelina Patti, Graziani, Mr. Cummings, and other favourite vocalists, took part, followed by the Handel chorus, "See, the Conquering Hero comes;" the national song, "Rule, Britannia;" the National Anthem, "God Save the Queen;" and the new song, composed by Mr. Stephen Glover, "God bless our Sailor Prince." After the concert, the two Princes and the royal party went out into the canopied balcony above the terrace, overlooking the Crystal Palace gardens, to see the playing of the fountains. An immense multitude of spectators were assembled on the terrace and steps. They, of course, welcomed the Duke of Edinburgh with the heartiest cheers, but did not omit to do honour, in like manner, to the Prince of Wales. The fountains were seen to advantage, there being no wind and not too dazzling sunshine. At a quarter before ten, when the twilight which succeeds to daylight had faded away, though not followed by darkness, the terraces were thronged by spectators of the fireworks. They had then the unexpected pleasure of welcoming the Princess of Wales, who presented herself, first in the royal box within the palace; afterwards in the balcony outside. All being ready, a few rockets and shells were fired as a preliminary. The pyrotechnic display began with the ceremony of saluting their Royal Highnesses with coloured signal lights, held by men of the 19th Middlesex Volunteers, stationed at equal distances along the entire line between the great fountains and the upper terrace. Next came the exhibition of an illuminated model of H.M.S. "Galatea," the frigate commanded by the Duke of Edinburgh in his late voyage. The length of the vessel was eighty feet, and the height of her topmast upwards of forty feet. She carried full sail, and as she stood on the "stocks," with her port-holes open and the British ensign flying at the foretop, the red and blue fires issuing from various parts of the ship and the deep green of the waves on which she appeared to ride produced a splendid effect; while rockets were flying and bursting in all directions, so that the sound was somewhat like that of a battle or cannonade at sea. After this came a brilliant cascade of fire, falling from a great height over a span of a hundred feet, accompanied by a battery of Roman candles extending along the upper terrace. From the

top of this cascade descended a stream of fire which seemed to threaten destruction to all around, but it was kept under skilful control. The music of the Coldstream Guards' band, by which this and other parts of the performances were accompanied, greatly heightened the effect. For the rest, the fireworks were made up of signal maroons, brilliant illuminations of the fountains, batteries of guns, and aerial maroons, followed by batteries of Roman candles, the descent of a fiery comet from each of the high towers, and conspicuous above all—next to the design of the "Galatea"—were two set pieces, in the shape of circular garlands, the one enclosing an anchor, with the words "Welcome, Alfred!" the other representing the Prince of Wales' feathers, with the single word "Welcome!" The royal guests remained until the last spark from the expiring rockets had died away. The number of the general company was above thirty thousand.

6. ACCOUCHEMENT OF THE PRINCESS OF WALES.—The Princess of Wales gave birth to a daughter at twenty-five minutes past four a.m., at Marlborough House. The Prince of Wales was present. The Secretary of State for the Home Department arrived at Marlborough House shortly after. The happy event was made known by the issue of a bulletin, of which the following is a copy:—

"Marlborough House, July 6, 5.30 a.m. Her Royal Highness the Princess of Wales was safely delivered of a Princess at 4.25 this morning. Her Royal Highness and the infant Princess are going on perfectly well.

"(Signed) ARTHUR FARRE, M.D.; E. H. SIEVEKING, M.D."

The Lord Mayor received, early in the morning, a copy of the bulletin, which was posted in front of the Mansion House. A royal salute was fired from the Park and the Tower guns, the bells of the various churches in the metropolis were rung, and the national standard and the Admiralty flag were hoisted in honour of the auspicious event. The shipping in the river was also dressed with colours. The Queen, accompanied by Princess Louis of Hesse and Princess Louisa, came from Windsor to London by special train, arriving shortly before noon, and drove to Marlborough House to visit the Princess.

Daily bulletins were issued announcing the favourable progress of her Royal Highness and the infant Princess.

10. ETON AND HARROW CRICKET MATCH.—The Eton and Harrow match began at Lord's at eleven a.m.; but such was the demand for space that carriages (empty, of course) took up their places five hours previously; and the ground, as is always the case on this occasion, was crowded with spectators. The Eton eleven was the favourite, 6 and 7 to 4, and 2 to 1 being laid upon them. The following is the score, from which it would seem that the Eton eleven were either very overrated or unlucky, as they were beat with seven wickets to spare. It is said their fielding was bad. Mr. Thornton, the Eton captain, made some splendid hits when he

went in. Fours and threes came in rapid succession, and at length he hit one ball straight over the Pavilion and out of the ground into a neighbouring garden. This was, perhaps, the greatest hit ever seen on Lord's, and must have measured some 120 yards:—

ETON.

W. Hay, Esq., b. Giles	2	l. b. w., b. Walker	17
W. C. Higgins, Esq., st. Pidcock, b. Walker	5	b. Walker	33
C. J. Thornton, Esq., b. Giles	44	b. Fryer	13
C. J. Ottaway, Esq., b. Giles	1	c. Pelham, b. Walker	9
W. F. Tritton, Esq., b. Giles	0	c. Pidcock, b. Pelham	10
Hon. G. Harris, b. Walker	23	b. Walker	6
H. M. Walter, Esq., c. Pidcock, b. Pelham	8	b. Pelham	
G. Longman, Esq., run out	2	thrown out by Gore	
J. Maude, Esq., b. Walker	8	c. and b. Walker	
S. E. Butler, Esq., hit wicket, b. Walker	0	not out	11
P. Currey, Esq., not out	11	st. Pidcock, b. Walker	7
Leg-byes, 10; byes, 2	12	Leg-byes, 6; byes, 2; wide, 2	10
116		123	

HARROW.

C. N. Walker, Esq., b. Butler	8	c. Hay, b. Thornton	3
A. Tabor, Esq., b. Thornton	38	b. Walter	14
S. W. Gore, Esq., c. Thornton, b. Walter	30	b. Walter	0
F. E. R. Fryer, Esq., c. Walter, b. Maude	31	not out	33
W. Wroughton, Esq., st. Longman, b. Higgins	5	not out	0
S. Pelham, Esq., b. Maude	4		
A. A. Apcar, Esq., b. Higgins	21		
W. H. Law, Esq., c. Higgins, 1 Thornton	12		
H. S. Hoare, Esq., b. Butler	6		
C. A. Pidcock, c. Walter, b. Maude	4		
C. T. Giles, Esq., not out	1	Leg-byes, 2; byes, 6; wide, 3;	
Leg-byes, 4; byes, 10; wide, 5	19	no ball, 1	12
179		62	

13. OPENING OF THE NEW MIDLAND RAILWAY LINE.—The new Midland line between London and Bedford was opened for passenger traffic, the trains running between the Moorgate-street, Aldersgate-street, Farringdon-street, and King's Cross stations of the Metropolitan Railway, and the Midland Company's stations at Camden-road, Kentish Town, Haverstock-hill, Finchley-road, and Hendon, the latter place forming the limit of the Midland suburban system.

— MEETING OF THE NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION AT WIMBLEDON.—This meeting commenced with its usual *éclat*, although, owing to the intense heat of the weather that prevailed during the encampment, it was not so extensively patronized by the public as on former occasions.

Two of the principal events of the prize-meeting were decided

on the 14th. The Prince of Wales's prize, value 100*l.*, five shots with the Enfield rifle at 200, 500, and 600 yards, was won by Private Lowe, 8th Lincolnshire (Sleaford) Rifles, with a score of 47 points, nearly two above the average of the three previous years. Private Ivory, 19th Middlesex, who won the Middlesex bronze medal on the preceding day, also got a place for 5*l.*, with 41 points. The first stage of the St. George's challenge vase contest was shot for at 500 yards, seven shots; and the vase and 25*l.* was won by Ensign Grieve, 4th Roxburgh, with 27 points—the same number as took the vase last year. The next in order of merit were Private Renton, 1st Lanark, 20*l.*; Sergeant Michie, London Scottish, 15*l.*; Private Deacon, 8th Berks, 10*l.*; Private Hewison, London Scottish, 9*l.*, each of whom scored 26 marks. There were a few more trials with military breech-loaders—at 500 yards Mr. E. Ross, with a Henry, fired twenty-three shots in the three minutes, and scored 54; Mr. M'Kerrell, with the new Kerr, twenty-six shots, scored 56; and Mr. Oswald, with a similar rifle, got off thirty-six shots, and scored 83. At the 200 yards' range in the same competition, the best shooting of the day was by Private Bird (South Middlesex), who on his first trial with the Henry got off twenty-nine shots and scored 77 points. The Walker-Money rifle was fired for the first time, by Ensign White, 37th Middlesex, who got off twenty-four rounds with great deliberation, and scored 65 points. The Daw cartridges, which are used with this rifle, worked admirably. Twelve consecutive bull's-eyes at 200 yards were made by Captain Turner, of the 3rd Manchester Volunteers, with a common Enfield rifle.

The chief interest attaching to the shooting on the 15th was the commencement of the contest for the Queen's prize. The first stage of this competition consists of ranges of 200, 500, and 600 yards, and is open to all volunteers, the highest shot being entitled to the silver medal of the Association, the silver badge, and 60*l.* in money. Other "next best" shots take money prizes varying in amount. In the second stage the sixty best shots in the first stage are brought together in ranges of 800, 900, and 1000 yards, and he who makes the highest score takes the most valuable prize and the gold medal of the association, thus becoming the hero of the season. At the close of the firing it was found that the highest possible had not been achieved, though three competitors came within one point of it. Twelve competitors made 18, thirty-eight made 17, while scores of 16 were as plentiful as blackberries. The "Daily Telegraph" cup competition was brought to a close after a close contest, the winner being Captain Wilkinson, 3rd West York. An Enfield competition for the Martin's challenge cup, value 50*l.*, was begun. The other competitions of the day were the Enfield Association cup, the competition for military breech-loaders, the "Eley" prize competition also for breech-loaders. For the Enfield Association cup, Ensign Pixley scored 38, out of a possible 40. The most noticeable of the

scores with the breech-loader was made at 200 yards by Private Bird, of the South Middlesex Rifles, who with a Henry smallbore scored 102 points thus—9 bull's-eyes, 16 centres, and 9 outers. One of the cartridges missed fire, or the score would have been even better. There was an alarm of fire in the camp in the afternoon, the grass having been accidentally set on fire; but, though the guards were turned out, their services were not required, as the blaze was trampled out in a few minutes.

On the 16th the annual match between representative members of the Lords and Commons Houses of Parliament took place, and was won by the Lords with a score of 278 against 277. There were six competitors aside, who with any rifle they pleased fired seven shots at 200 and 500 yards. Targets No. 45 and 46 for the 200 yards, and 35 and 36 for the 500 yards, were set apart for the competition. The scores were: Lords—Earl Denbigh, 52; Earl Ducie, 51; Earl Spencer, 48; Earl Denmore, 44; Marquis of Abercorn, 43; and Lord Dufferin, 40: total, 278. Commons—Marquis of Lorne, 48; Mr. Malcolm, 48; Mr. Fordyce, 48; Mr. Bass, 48; Sir P. Egerton, 48; and the Hon. C. T. Lyttelton, 37: total, 277.

The great event of the 18th was the competition for the Irish international challenge trophy. The Prince of Wales and Prince Teck visited the camp, and a numerous and distinguished company was present. The competitors for the international trophy were Captain Armstrong, of the 1st Lanark, representing Ireland; Sergeant Plenderleith, Peebles, for Scotland; and Corporal Keppelstone, 6th Lancashire, for England. The firing was at 200, 500, and 600 yards; and the result was that Ireland scored 59; Scotland, 54; and England, 37. The Prince of Wales and Prince Teck attended the meeting in the afternoon, and stayed at some of the firing-points to watch the shooting. Happening to be at the 600-yards' range when the international Irish trophy match was concluded, the Prince of Wales presented the winner, Captain Armstrong, the representative of Ireland, with the victor's badge, and congratulated him. The Prince then visited the ranges at which the breech-loading competition was going on, and had a shot or two at the running deer.

On the 21st the heat was so intense that many of the competitors retired from the contests. Steward's thermometer registered the greatest heat in the shade at 101. Of the competitions and matches which were concluded, the principal one of the meeting was that for the championship gold medal and her Majesty's prize of 250*l*. Corporal Peake, of the 8th Lancashire, made the capital score of 70 marks—the best one made for the Queen's prize. A protest, however, against his receiving the prize, on the ground of his having used wads other than those issued by the authorities, was allowed by the council; and Lieutenant J. B. Carslake, of the 5th Somerset (Bridgwater), with a score of 65, was officially declared the winner of the Queen's prize.

A protest against his score was pronounced by the council to be frivolous. Corporal Bell (8th Lancashire) stood close to Mr. Carslake in the scoring. The Public Schools matches resulted in a double victory for Eton, the eleven of that school having won the Ashburton shield with 248 points, and their best shot, Mr. Bruce, having won the Spencer cup with 21. The total scores were as follow:—Eton, 248; Marlborough, 245; Cheltenham, 241; Rugby, 241; Harrow, 213; Winchester, 203; Rossall, 194.

On the 22nd, in the Oxford and Cambridge match, Cambridge won the Chancellor's plate. The respective scores were—Cambridge, 424; Oxford, 406. In the afternoon Lord Napier of Magdala visited the regimental camp of the 1st Surrey Rifles, the officers of which corps had prepared a splendid luncheon, to which he had been invited; but the General was not able to do more than go to the mess-tent during the luncheon, where he was met by Lieutenant-Colonel Macdonald, General Sir G. Pollock, General Alexander, and Major-General Scott, and received most enthusiastically. Lord Napier drank the health of the 1st Surrey in a loving cup; and, after shaking hands with several of the officers, went with Earl and Countess Spencer and Colonel Colville to see some of the shooting; after which he had luncheon with Earl Spencer in the pavilion, and departed amidst enthusiastic cheering.

On the 23rd the three national eights shot for the Elcho challenge shield. England was the winner, making a grand total of 1166 points, Ireland made 1121, and Scotland 1117. The scores were:—England, 800 yards, 419 points; 999 yards, 388 points; 1000 yards, 359 points: total, 1166. Ireland: 800 yards, 412 points; 900 yards, 365 points; 1000 yards, 344 points: total, 1121 points. Scotland: 800 yards, 402 points; 900 yards, 380 points; 1000 yards, 335 points: total, 1117. England was thus the winner by a majority of 45 over Ireland, and of 49 over Scotland. The shooting—considering the wind, which towards the end of the match was very strong and gusty—was splendid throughout, the score of the English being larger by 69 than the winning score of last year.

The following is the official list of the prizes, their value, the name and corps of the winners, and the number of marks made:—

	Marks.
Extra prizes, first series, Lieutenant Hodge, Fifeshire	
" third series, Major Mitchell, 1st Clackmannan	28
Nursery Stakes, second stage, 20l., Private Smith, 1st Lanark	26
Jennison, 200 yards, 25l., Corporal Fraser, 7th Inverness	28
" 600 yards, 30l., Captain Jaques, Surrey	28
Albert, 200 yards, 20l., Ensign Boynton, 5th East York	28
" 500 yards, 20l., Ensign Boynton, 5th East York	28
" 600 yards, 20l., Captain Thomas, 4th West York	28
" 800 yards, 20l., Major Jopp, 1st Aberdeen	28
" first aggregate, 20l., Colour-Sergeant Cortis, 11th Sussex	107
" second stage, 100l., Colour-Sergeant Ross, London Scottish	75
Any Rifle Association Cup, 50l., Private M. R. Smith, Victorias	54

	Marks.
Any Rifle Wimbledon Cup, 100l., Colour-Sergeant Clews, 3rd Renfrew	52
Dudley, 50l., Ensign H. Smith, 15th Surrey	42
Elcho Shield, 1000l., England	1168
Extra Prizes, second series, Corporal Hays, London Rifle Brigade	19
fourth series, Lieutenant Campbell, 89th Regiment	20
"Earwig," 20l., Lieutenant-Colonel Bertram, Warrington	17
Henry Prizes, first, Private M'Kerrell, London Scottish	18
second, Private C. B. Dunlop, 1st Inverness	17
"The Daily Telegraph," 52l. 10s., Captain Wilkinson, 3rd West York	19
Martin's Cup, 50l., Private Drewitt, 13th Surrey	19
Windmill, second stage, 25l., Corporal Forrest, 2nd Roxburgh	19
Alexandra, 200 yards, 20l., Mr. Webster, 1st Notts	20
500 yards, 20l., Private Thornbury, Victorias	20
600 yards, 20l., Private Block, Victorias	19
second stage, 50l., Private Kingsmill, 4th Surrey	24
Enfield Association Cup, 50l., Private Pouncy, St. George's	38
Wimbledon Cup, 100l., Colour-Sergeant Montgomery, 30th Middlesex	33
H. Peek, 52l. 10s., Colour-Sergeant Cortis, 11th Sussex	39
Swiss Cartons, 200 Enfield Central, 25l., A. G. Smith	
500 " 25l., G. E. Bulmer	
600 " 25l., A. G. Smith	
200 Any Rifle 25l., R. H. Dunlop, C.B., L.S.	
500 " 25l., Captain Malcolm, Argyleshire	
600 " 20l., Captain Malcolm, Argyleshire	
Ashburton Challenge Shield, 140l., Eton	248
Spencer Cup, 15l., Mr. Bruce	
Chancellor's Challenge Cup, 100l., Cambridge University	424
Belgian Challenge Cup, 100l., 2nd Berks	169
China Cup, 525l., 1st Somerset	383
Irish International Challenge Trophy, 500l., Captain Armstrong, 1st Lanark	59
International Enfield Trophy, England	
St. George's Vase, first prize, 275l., Ensign Grieve, 4th Roxburgh	27
second prize, 20l., Private Renton, 1st Lanark	26
Dragon Cup, 50l., Private Hewison, London Scottish	22
Duke of Cambridge, 50l., Mr. Farquharson, Perthshire	22
Prince of Wales, 100l., Private Lowe, 8th Lincoln	47
The Queen's Prize, first stage, first thirty winners, 15l., Private Woodford, 2nd Isle of Wight	50
15l., Captain Burt, 1st Warwick	50
15l., Colour-Sergeant Clews, 8th Renfrew	50
15l., Private Hinde, 2nd London	49
15l., Corporal Egg, Queen's (Westminster)	47
15l., Private Young, 1st Herts	47
15l., Lieutenant Menzies, 1st Edinburgh	47
15l., Corporal Cooper, 36th West York	47
15l., Private Brooks, 9th Leicester	47
15l., Sergeant Arrowsmith, 1st Gloucester	46
15l., Corporal Innes, 2nd Banff	46
15l., Quartermaster-Sergeant Soames, 7th Kent	46
15l., Corporal Thompson, 12th Cheshire	46
15l., Ensign Brooks, 9th Berks	46
15l., Corporal Cameron, 6th Inverness	46
15l., Private Whitehead, 8th Lancashire	46
15l., Private Cook, 2nd Oxford	46
15l., Sergeant Dunn, 1st London	46
15l., Corporal Bennet, 21st Somerset	46
15l., Corporal Fraser, 7th Inverness	46
15l., Colour-Sergeant Munn, 2nd Essex	46
15l., Sergeant Blenkhorn, 15th North York	46
15l., Ensign Hodgkinson, 32nd Stafford	46
15l., Sergeant Goodall, 7th Stafford	46
15l., Colour-Sergeant Graham, 2nd Wilts	46
15l., Ensign Oakes, 6th Lincoln	46
15l., Captain Simcoe, 6th Cornwall	46

	Marks.
The Queen's Prize, 15 <i>l.</i> , Sergeant Bacchus, South Middlesex	46
" 15 <i>l.</i> , Corporal Peake, 6th Lancashire	46
A Silver Medal, 60 <i>l.</i> , Drum-Major Hutchinson, Bristol Rifles	51
Queen's Prize, second stage, and Gold Medal of the N.R.A., 250 <i>l.</i> , Lieutenant* Caralake, 5th Somerset	65

On the 25th Lieutenant-General Lord Napier of Magdala performed the ceremony of handing the prizes to the successful competitors. Lord Napier came on the ground in an open carriage, accompanied by Lady Spencer, the Marquis of Donegal, and Lord Longford, Under Secretary for War. In a second carriage were Lady Napier, General Scott (her Ladyship's father), and General Peel, Earl Spencer and Captain Costier accompanying the party on horseback. Lord Napier wore, with the uniform of general officer, the ribbon and order of the Bath. Having alighted from his carriage, he was led to a small marquee, beneath which were placed chairs for him and those in his company. On baize-covered tables were ranged all the prizes of value above 20*l.* The challenge cups and shields made a goodly show, together with trophies newly designed for presentation.

Earl Spencer, addressing Lord Napier, who had been conducted to a small temporary platform, said that, before the noble lord commenced the duty he had kindly undertaken to perform, it would be a great compliment to the volunteers, represented by the National Rifle Association, if he would consent to be enrolled as an honorary member of the body. Lord Napier very readily and gracefully assented, and, as the badge of the association was being fastened on his breast, the cheers of the assembly broke forth loudly. His Lordship, when silence ensued, said, "I have great pleasure, my Lords, Ladies, and Gentlemen, in accepting this mark of favour which Lord Spencer, representing the volunteers of this country, has done me the honour to present to me. I am greatly obliged to him for having given me the opportunity of being enrolled among the volunteers of England. My experience in the mutiny of India has taught me that, however perfect a small standing army may be, still, its numbers being small, it is unable to take advantage of its successes; and it appears to me that the volunteers of England are exactly that supplementary force which the standing army of England requires. As the youngest member of your volunteer force, and as a humble individual, I shall see with the greatest pleasure every encouragement which is offered to the volunteers, and should be extremely glad to witness every year an increase in their numbers."

Several times during this short and soldierly address cheers were renewed; and again when the speaker concluded. He then proceeded to his duty of distributing the prizes. To each of the winners as he came forward Lord Napier spoke a few well-chosen words. As the International or Elcho shield—a fine piece of embossed ironwork—was borne away on the shoulders of those crack

marksmen, the Messrs. Pixley, Nosworthy, Metford, and Radcliffe, who represented the English winners, Lord Napier said he was sure that England was proud of having won the shield; that Scotland had a great fancy for it, having won it twice; but that Ireland intended to have it next time. This remark was warmly applauded by the volunteers and those of the spectators who were near enough to hear the words. The great incident of the ceremony was, of course, the presentation of the Queen's prize, value 250*l.*, and the gold medal of the Association. The winner, Lieutenant Carslake, 5th Somerset, was warmly cheered on presenting himself; and Lord Napier said that of all the prizes he had had the honour to distribute there was none more interesting or more valuable than that given by Her Majesty. Earl Spencer called for the thanks of all present to Lord Napier for the honour he had done them in distributing the prizes. It was a matter of great honour to win a prize at the meetings of the National Rifle Association; it was an additional honour to receive it from the hands of one who, like Lord Napier of Magdala, had done so much to add to the lustre of the British army abroad. His Lordship called for three hearty cheers for Lord Napier, which were very cordially given. A similar compliment was paid to Lady Napier, and with this the ceremony terminated. The guard of honour at the distribution of prizes was under the command of Colonel Warde, and consisted of the London Rifle Brigade, the Tower Hamlets, and the 19th and 26th Middlesex.

The review commenced at six o'clock. The Prince of Wales and the Duke of Edinburgh had arrived an hour before, in a carriage with outriders, escorted by a detachment of the 17th Lancers. They met Earl Spencer and Lord Napier at the cottage. A few minutes before the review the two Princes mounted on horseback and rode on the ground with Lord Spencer and General Hamilton, who was to direct the manœuvres. The Prince of Wales wore the uniform of a general officer, and the Duke of Edinburgh wore that of Colonel of the 1st City of London Artillery. The troops assembled were but 5000 in number, and several of the best metropolitan corps were absent. Three brigades, commanded by Earl Grosvenor, Lord Truro, and Lord Ranelagh, were formed of the infantry, consisting of some companies of each of these corps:—the 46th Middlesex, 4th Middlesex, 36th Middlesex, 2nd Administrative Battalion Surrey, 48th Middlesex, 1st London and 1st Middlesex Engineers, 15th Middlesex (London Scottish), 19th Middlesex, 39th Middlesex, 49th Middlesex (Post Office), Victoria Rifle Corps, St. George's, South Middlesex, 3rd London, London Rifle Brigade, 26th Middlesex (Customs), Queen's (Westminster), and 37th Middlesex; besides which there were squadrons of the Middlesex Yeomanry Cavalry and of the 1st Herts Light Horse, a battalion of the 1st London and 1st Surrey Artillery, and five companies of the 3rd Middlesex Artillery. The manœuvres were simple enough: a line was drawn up facing the east, with its rear

to the butts, and skirmishers were sent forward to cover its advance; but after some file firing, the line retired; there was a charge of cavalry, when the line changed front, and formed at right angles to its original position; the artillery then opened fire, and repulsed the imaginary foe. The troops afterwards marched past the Prince of Wales, and saluted. The Duke of Edinburgh rode at the head of the battalion of artillery. Their Royal Highnesses and the rest of the company soon returned to town.

15. PRESENTATION OF THE LANCASHIRE COTTON-FAMINE MEMORIAL WINDOW IN GUILDHALL.—The new stained-glass window erected in Guildhall was presented to the Corporation of the City of London in the name of the cotton-factory workpeople of Lancashire, Cheshire, and Derbyshire, as a testimony of their gratitude for the bounty which contributed half a million sterling to relieve their distress in the time of the American civil war. A deputation from those counties, headed by the Right Hon. Colonel J. Wilson Patten, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, waited upon the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council, to perform the act of presentation. Besides the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, the deputation was composed of Lord Egerton of Tatton, Lord Edward Howard, M.P., Mr. Bazley, M.P., Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P., and about thirty other gentlemen.

The Lord Mayor, Sheriffs, and Aldermen took their seats on a dais at the lower end of the hall, between the figures of Gog and Magog, while the Common Councilmen sat on benches arranged at the sides of the hall. The deputation was introduced and admitted to the dais, where Colonel Wilson Patten spoke, explaining that the Earl of Derby, whose labours as chairman of the central committee in Lancashire especially qualified him to represent the operatives, would have performed this duty, but the noble earl's health prevented his attendance. Colonel Wilson Patten noticed his absence with regret, and then briefly narrated the history of the cotton famine and the means adopted to alleviate the distress arising out of it. The names of Alderman Cotton, whose proposal ended in the formation of the Mansion House Committee, the late Alderman Cubitt, Alderman Lawrence, Alderman Hale, and Alderman Rose, he mentioned as specially remembered in Lancashire. Lord Egerton of Tatton spoke on behalf of the operatives of Cheshire, Lord E. Howard for those of Derbyshire, and Mr. Bazley, M.P., speaking for the manufacturers, seized the opportunity to point out how much the country was to blame in relying for eighty-five per cent. of its raw cotton upon a country where it was produced by slave labour, while not more than seven per cent. came from our own colonial cotton-growing possessions. In his concluding sentence the hon. member agreed with the previous speakers that the operatives had endured their privations with fortitude and resignation, and added from his own experience that it was a special consolation to them to know that henceforth the supplies of raw material would come from free and not slave

lands—a remark that elicited general cheering. A resolution passed by some Oldham overlookers having been read by the Rev. Mr. Jones, the gift of the window was acknowledged by Alderman Cotton on behalf of the Mansion House Committee, and by the Lord Mayor on behalf of the Corporation. A testimonial was afterwards presented to Mr. Joseph Gibbs, the zealous and efficient honorary secretary of the Mansion House Fund.

21. MEMORIAL TO LORD PALMERSTON AT ROMSEY.—A bronze statue of the late Lord Palmerston, erected in the market-place of Romsey, was unveiled, and the stained-glass memorial window at the west end of the abbey church was also displayed to public view. The day was kept as a holiday in the town, and the railways from Winchester, Salisbury, Southampton, and other places, brought hundreds of persons anxious to witness this additional mark of respect for the statesman whose name had been so long coupled with Broadlands and Romsey. The day was brilliantly fine, and Romsey, decked with flags and evergreens, looked its best. At half-past one o'clock the Mayor and Corporation in their robes, the borough magistrates, the executive committee, the Broadlands tenantry, and subscribers to the memorials, assembled at the Town hall, and, escorted by the 11th Hants Rifle Volunteers and their band, walked in procession to Broadlands Park, where they were joined by Mr. Cowper, M.P., the Duke of Argyll, the Bishop of London, Earl Granville, Earl De Grey, the Earl of Shaftesbury, Viscount Halifax, Viscount Eversley, Lord Stanley of Alderley, Lord Northbroke, Mr. Lowe, M.P., Mr. Dutton, M.P., Colonel French, M.P., Mr. Bonham-Carter, M.P., Mr. Evelyn Ashley, and others. Earl Russell and Mr. Gladstone had been expected, but were unable to be present—the former prevented by a domestic affliction, the latter by his parliamentary duties. Sir Augustus Clifford, Usher of the Black Rod, was prevented from attending by the illness of his son, the Yeoman Usher. With the additions to its numbers from the visitors to Broadlands, the procession returned to the fine old abbey church of Romsey, where a special afternoon service was held. The prayers were read by the Vicar, the Rev. E. L. Berthon, and the lessons by the Archdeacon of Winchester. The Bishop of London was the preacher, and took for his text Ecclesiastes iii. 9 and part of 14. Before the service the window was unveiled. It was designed by Messrs. Clayton and Bell, and forms at the west end of the abbey a triplet of lancets, said to be almost without parallel for size and proportion, the centre light being 39 ft. by 5 ft. 7 in., and the two side lights 36 ft. 6 in. by 4 ft. 2 in. each. The artist's aim was "to exemplify the idea of government descending from heaven to earth." At the bottom are the heraldic bearings of Lord Palmerston and the following inscription:—"In memory of Viscount Palmerston: obit 1865." At the conclusion of the service the procession, in which several Mayors from neighbouring towns took

part, was re-formed, and proceeded now to the market-place, where a platform and dais had been erected close by the statue. The Mayor of Romsey (Mr. F. Cressey) having opened the proceedings, the statue was uncovered, the volunteers presenting arms and the band playing the National Anthem. The statue was designed by Mr. Noble, and represents Lord Palmerston in the act of addressing the House of Commons. Including the bronze plinth, it is eight feet ten inches high, and the pedestal is nine feet eight inches high. The latter is formed of Aberdeen granite, and at the base is about six feet eight inches square. On the front of the polished shaft is inscribed, in letters of gold, "Palmerston," and at the back, "Born 1784. Died 1865." Viscount Eversley, chairman of the executive committee of subscribers to the memorials, being called on by the Mayor, said a few words upon the occasion, and invited Earl Granville to speak the inaugural address. Earl Granville, in so doing, praised the character of Lord Palmerston, and extolled his public services; he dwelt especially on the warm personal attachment which most of the Liberal party always felt for their late political leader. Mr. Lowe followed, bearing his testimony to the great abilities and industry of Lord Palmerston, whom he admired as a thorough Englishman and a statesman devoted to his duty. Those who had taken part in the proceedings adjourned to luncheon in a marquee erected near the church, where the chair was taken by Mr. Cowper, and speeches were made by the Duke of Argyll and Mr. Cardwell in reply to the toast of the two Houses of Parliament.

On the 22nd Mr. Gladstone, who was unable to be present at the "inauguration" of Lord Palmerston's memorial on the previous day, visited Romsey, and was presented with an address by the corporation. The right hon. gentleman delivered a reply of considerable length, in which, after touching on the personal characteristics of Lord Palmerston, he alluded both to the Reform and Irish Church questions.

30. OPENING OF THE THAMES EMBANKMENT.—The opening to foot-passengers of the river terrace along the Thames Embankment, from the steamboat-pier at Essex-street, Strand, to Westminster Bridge, took place. There was no ceremony; but a numerous company of visitors, invited for the occasion, arrived between eleven and twelve o'clock at Westminster Bridge, and walked over the pavement, headed by Sir John Thwaites, the chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works; accompanied by Lord John Manners, Mr. Tite, Mr. Ayrton, Mr. Cowper, and Mr. Bazalgette, the engineer and designer of the works. After walking along the embankment to the pier at Essex-street, Sir John Thwaites took off his hat, and, standing almost alone, declared the road open. At this signal a salute of guns was fired, and the public were at once admitted to the use of the footway. The party then went on board special steamboats, and so down the river to the Abbey Mills pumping-station at North Woolwich.

The footway thus opened is beautifully flagged with Yorkshire stone for about two-thirds of its length. Some idea may be formed of the magnitude and importance of the undertaking when it is stated that a river wall in granite eight feet in thickness has been built so as to enclose nearly thirty acres of ground. This wall is nearly 7000 feet long; it averages more than 40 feet high, and its foundations go from 16 feet to 30 feet below the bed of the river. In the formation of this wall and the auxiliary works of drainage, subways, and filling in with earth behind it, there have been used nearly 700,000 cubic feet of granite, about 30,000,000 bricks, over 300,000 bushels of cement, nearly a million cubic feet of concrete; 125,000 cubic yards of earth have had to be dug out, and no less than 1,200,000 cubic yards of earth filled in. Such stupendous quantities of material, expended over such a space of ground, have never till now been employed.

— OPENING OF THE ABBEY MILLS PUMPING-STATION.—On the same day this new pumping-station at West Ham, near Stratford-at-the-Bow, was opened by Sir John Thwaites, with a party of members of the Board and visitors. The pumping-station at Abbey Mills is a most important portion of the scheme for the main drainage of London. One prominent feature of the design is the attempt which has been made, as far as possible, to remove the sewage by gravitation, and thus to reduce the pumping to a minimum. It is, however, impossible for sewage to fall by gravitation for a distance of ten or twelve miles from districts which are lower than or near the level of the river, and yet at their outfall to be delivered at the level of high water, without the aid of pumping. Thus it happens that all the sewage on the south side of the Thames, and the sewage of a portion of the north side, has to be lifted, and for this purpose there are four pumping-stations, two on each side of the river. Of those on the south side, one is situate at Deptford Creek, of 500 nominal horse-power, and the other at the Crossness outfall, which was opened by the Prince of Wales in April, 1865, and which is also of 500 nominal horse-power. Of the two on the north side, the largest and most important is that of the Abbey Mills, which is 1140 nominal horse-power. The fourth will be the smallest station, being of 240 nominal horse-power only, and situated at Pimlico.

The whole of the very extensive works contained in the Abbey Mills pumping-station have been constructed after the designs of Mr. J. W. Bazalgette, C.E., engineer-in-chief to the Metropolitan Board of Works, and under the personal superintendence of Mr. Edmund Cooper, the resident engineer. The buildings have been erected by Mr. W. Webster, contractor, of London. The engines, boilers, and pumping machinery have been made and erected by Messrs. Rothwell and Co., of the Union Foundry, Bolton, Lancashire, one of the oldest engineering establishments in the country.

31. FATAL PANIC AT A MANCHESTER MUSIC HALL.—A de-

plorable accident occurred at a place of amusement known as "Lang's Victoria Music Hall," Victoria-bridge, by which twenty-three persons lost their lives and twelve others were injured. The rooms in which the entertainments were held occupied the three upper floors of a four-story building, the outer portion of which was a range of shops. Nearly 2000 persons were admitted in the evening at twopence each, the ordinary price, to witness the benefit performance of Mr. and Mrs. Clifford, vocalists. The performances commenced at half-past six. Shortly after ten some of the youths who were in the front part of the audience in the pit, in their eagerness to obtain a better view of what was going on upon the stage, stood upon the benches, one or two of which were broken. Two or three of the lads, who felt themselves falling from the benches, tried to hold themselves up by clutching at a slender gas-pendant. The pipe broke in two, and some one at once plugged it fast with paper. No evil consequences would have followed had not somebody in the pit raised an alarm of "Fire!" There was immediately a rush to the staircase from the two upper galleries.

The staircase was five feet wide, and wound up between walls from the ground floor to the top gallery, with a landing stage at each gallery. The crush of people attempting to leave was terrific, and appears to have been the sole cause of the loss of life. Mr. Clifford, from the stage, did all he could to allay the panic, by telling the people there was nothing to fear if they would only keep their places. All remonstrances were vain. Men and women struggled through the three outlets to a narrow corridor which leads to the common staircase, and precipitated themselves recklessly one over another down the first flight. The degree of pressure at the onset may be judged from the fact that out of an audience of nearly 1000 in the two galleries scarcely a score forbore to join in the scramble. The other half of the audience, who were in the pit, would find comparatively safe egress from a separate staircase. From a quarter-past ten to eleven o'clock twenty-three dead bodies were received at the Infirmary. A large number of severely injured cases were also taken to the Infirmary, of which ten or eleven were considered so dangerous that they were sent for treatment to the surgical wards. Eight persons, after receiving treatment for bruises and contused wounds, were sent out. Shortly after the accident occurred, and as soon as information of its disastrous nature had time to spread, a large and deeply excited crowd gathered outside of the Infirmary gates, many of whom were women, who, believing that their friends might be among the killed, made clamorous entreaties to be admitted to the dead-house, but up to midnight it was impossible to admit any one within the walls.

The Victoria Music Hall is a place of humble pretensions, although, apparently, a very popular place of resort. There is little or no attempt at decoration, and the benches and other

fittings are constructed with an evident regard for durability under possible rough usage from some of the audience. The dancing saloon is a separate room entirely, above the music hall, and was unoccupied at the time of the accident. Since the death of Mr. Benjamin Lang the place had been tenanted by Mr. R. D. Davies, who was absent on the night of the accident, being at Buxton for the benefit of his health. According to a notice posted up on the premises, boys were not admitted to the music hall, but it is probable that on occasions of benefit nights the rules of the management are considerably relaxed. Certainly there were many turbulent spirits in the crowd and several benches were broken and had to be removed some time before the accident occurred which ended so fatally. There was, also, at least one other gas-pipe broken in the pit, and safely plugged again, long before the pipe was broken near the stage, as above-mentioned. The nature of the entertainment may be gathered from the fact that the momentary cause of excitement when the two or three benches gave way at the last was the event of a "sack race" across the stage.

Even after the rush from the "hall" it is doubtful whether 5% of damage could be found to have been done to the building or its fittings. The principal breakage was that of an iron balustrade, which extended down the middle of the stairway from the galleries. The object of this division was to keep people going upstairs on one side the rail while the other side was free for descending. This firmly rivetted railing was forced out of its fastenings on each step of the stairway by the pressure of the crowd who attempted to pour down it. The barrier removed, the whole five foot space was left clear. The steps themselves, apart from the width of the stairway, were too narrow for any thing but careful walking, and for a crowd rushing down it would be little better than descending a ladder. A turn in the stairs forms a very breakneck angle for anybody forced to descend them on the side where, according to rule, he ought only to be going up, with the middle railing to hold on by. In other respects the provision for egress was probably no worse than is common at places of public entertainment.

The dead bodies were almost entirely those of young men and boys, including a number of the "Arab" type, who frequent the streets in the neighbourhood of the railway station. There were only three women among the number.

The inquiries made at the Infirmary the next morning after "missing friends" revealed a social fact at once sad and suggestive. Setting aside the number of those who made their way to the Infirmary office from mere motives of curiosity, a class which, as far as possible, was rigidly excluded from the building, there were scores, probably hundreds, of applications by terrified parents after children who had not been home during the night, and whose forms might be laid out lifeless in the mortuary, or stretched in

pain on the beds in the surgical wards. For some hours, until the list of identifications approached completion, the corridors of the Infirmary were literally thronged with such applicants. They were mostly persons belonging to the lowest classes, but they also included a large number of working men, who, having heard of the accident at their early work in mills and warehouses, came in their shirt sleeves to dispel in most instances, in one or two, unhappily, to confirm, their fears. One and all received the kindest attention from the medical staff and officers on duty at the Infirmary.

AUGUST.

4. THE BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION AT OXFORD.—The meetings of the annual conference of the British Medical Association were held this year at Oxford. This association was founded, thirty-six years ago, by the late Sir Charles Hastings, of Worcester, to unite the metropolitan and provincial members of the profession, with a view to the advancement of medical science and the general interests of the medical profession. Its operations are now extended not only throughout the kingdom, but to the colonies and our Indian empire. During the last two years it has made very great progress, as there has been an addition of 1500 members, and on its rolls are the names of the professors of our great Universities. The president for this year was Dr. Acland, F.R.S., Professor of Medicine in the University of Oxford. About 600 gentlemen were gathered together from all parts of Great Britain, including many of the highest professional distinction. The different meetings were held in the great hall of Christ Church College, in the Divinity School, and in the University Museum. Essays were read, followed by discussions upon various topics of medical science and practice, and questions affecting the health of the people. The authorities of the University on this occasion conferred the honorary degree of D.C.L. upon the following medical gentlemen:—Sir Charles Locock, M.D., F.R.S.; Sir W. Jenner, M.D., F.R.S.; the Rev. Samuel Houghton, M.D., F.R.S.; Mr. William Withey Gull, M.D.; Mr. James Paget, F.R.S.; Mr. John Simon, F.R.S.; and Mr. James Syme, F.R.S. The degrees were bestowed in the Sheldonian Theatre by the Vice-Chancellor, the Rev. Dr. Leighton, Principal of All Souls' College, with the usual formalities.

5. DEPARTURE OF THE QUEEN FOR SWITZERLAND.—Her Majesty the Queen—travelling incognito, as the Countess of Kent—embarked, from Osborne Pier, shortly after noon, in the royal yacht "Victoria and Albert," Captain his Serene Highness the Prince of Leiningen, which immediately afterwards sailed for Cherbourg.

The royal yacht was attended across the Channel by the "Enchantress," Government steam-yacht, Staff Commander John E. Pettey, R.N., and by the "Black Eagle" steam-yacht, Staff Commander Thomas J. Whillier, R.N. The royal flotilla arrived off Cherbourg at 6 p.m.

Her Majesty and the royal family dined on board the yacht and disembarked at 11 p.m. on the Government jetty, where a flying bridge, leading direct from the arsenal to the departure-platform of the station of the Chemin de Fer de l'Ouest, had been especially constructed, to obviate the necessity of using carriages for the conveyance of the royal party from the dockyard to the railway station. The Emperor placed at the disposal of the Queen an imperial train, consisting of ten vehicles, several of which are fitted up with luxurious magnificence.

The royal party left Cherbourg at 11 p.m. and arrived in Paris at seven o'clock a.m. on the 6th.

At the station of the Cremin de Fer de l'Ouest, in Paris, her Majesty was received by his Excellency Lord Lyons, British Ambassador at the Court of Paris, with his staff, and by several French officers of distinction.

The Queen and the royal party proceeded in the Ambassador's carriages from the railway station to the hotel of the Embassy, where her Majesty remained during the day. The Empress Eugenie visited the Queen at a quarter-past three in the afternoon, and remained with her Majesty until four o'clock. The Duke of Edinburgh arrived in the morning by way of Calais, and immediately on his arrival paid a visit to the Queen.

Her Majesty continued her journey in the evening, leaving Paris at 9 p.m. by the Chemin de Fer de l'Est, using the same imperial train which conveyed the royal party from Cherbourg to Paris. The distance from Paris to Bâle, on the Swiss frontier, is 323 English miles—the route, except on the hilly wine districts, having little of a picturesque character to recommend it. At Bâle her Majesty and the royal party partook of breakfast, and here the officials of the Chemin de Fer de l'Est resigned charge of the train to the officers of the Central Swiss Railway, over which her Majesty travelled henceforward to Lucerne. This railway, the works of which were executed by Mr. Brassey, traverses the district of the Jura, through very beautiful scenery, to Olten, at which point branches diverge to Lucerne and other Swiss centres. The Queen, after breakfasting, proceeded on her journey through exquisite scenery, and arrived at Lucerne on the morning of the 7th.

The Queen and the royal family occupied, during their stay at Lucerne, a beautifully situated residence, called the Villa (Pension) Wallace. It stands on a hill overlooking the town, with the Rhigi on the left, and Mont Pilatus, distinguished by its serrated ridge, upon the right, and the lake and snowy St. Gothard range of Alps immediately in front.

The other members of the royal suite were accommodated in a pretty chalet situated in the grounds, and closely adjoining the lake.

6. **ROYAL CHRISTENING.**—This morning the Bishop of London baptized the daughter of the Prince and Princess of Wales. His Lordship was assisted by the Dean of Westminster. The Princess received the names of Victoria Alexandra Olga Mary. The sponsors included Queen Victoria, the Emperor Alexander, the Queen of Greece, and the Dowager Queen of Denmark.

13. **FEARFUL EARTHQUAKES IN SOUTH AMERICA.**—A succession of terrible earthquakes ravaged the countries of Peru and Ecuador.

The following telegram was afterwards received through the Atlantic cable:—

“New York.

“According to advices received here from Central America, published in the papers, fearful earthquakes have totally destroyed the cities and towns of Arica, Arequipa, Islay, Iquique, Pisco, Juancavelica, Ibarra, and numerous other towns of Peru and Ecuador.

“The loss of life in Peru is estimated at 2000, in Ecuador at 20,000. ●

“The greater number of the inhabitants of the Peruvian seaport town of Arica, and of Arequipa, the chief town of the Peruvian littoral province of Arequipa, escaped with their lives.

“The loss of property is estimated at 60,000,000*l*.

“Great damage was also done to the shipping near the coast and at the Chincha Islands.”

Later accounts brought by the West India mails stated that Arequipa was entirely destroyed; the cathedral was left partly standing, but not a single house remained habitable. The earthquake commenced with an undulating movement, and as the shock culminated no one could keep his feet. The houses rocked as a ship in the trough of the sea, and came crumbling down. The shrieks of the women and the crash of falling masonry, the upheaving of the earth and the clouds of blinding dust, made up a scene that cannot be described. There were nineteen minor shocks the same night, and the earth still continued in motion. The earth opened in all the plains around, and water appeared in various places. The loss of life, however, at Arequipa was confined to the prisoners in the gaol and a few sick persons in the hospital, and estimated at 200 persons. At Islay the mole was almost destroyed, and several launches or small vessels. Almost every stone or cement building in this town was greatly damaged, or shaken so as to be unfit to dwell in.

Captain Fox, of the wrecked Liverpool barque “Chanarcillo,” furnished an account of the disaster at Arica to the West India papers. The town of Arica was laid in ruins by earthquake at five o'clock in the afternoon. Half an hour afterwards the lower

part of the town was submerged by an earthquake wave; when the first wave receded, the shipping in the bay was lying in eight fathoms of water. The ships all grounded, leaving about six feet of water alongside. The second return wave was a breaking one, at an elevation of about sixty feet, which destroyed the American store-ship "Fredonia," with all on board, the Peruvian barque "Rosa Riviera," the brig "Edoardo," with all hands, and the Peruvian frigate "Americana," which was thrown 300 yards above high-water mark. Her principal officers, with about 130 of her crew, were drowned. The barque "Chanarcillo" was also thrown 500 yards above high-water mark. Captain Fox was on shore when the earthquake occurred, and despatched his boat to bring the crew of his vessel to the land to assist the panic-stricken inhabitants, many of whom were partially buried in the ruins, some with their heads just above ground. The scene was described as most heartrending, the people shrieking and gesticulating in a dreadful manner. When the wave burst over the city it drowned those who were partially buried by the earthquake. The remainder of the crew, eight in number, who were left on board in charge of the "Chanarcillo," perished with her. It is considered that Arica was the centre of the earthquake and the earthquake waves, and consequently that town suffered the most.

At Ilo, not a vestige of a habitation of any kind was left, either at the port or in the town. What was not knocked down by the shock was swept away by the flood, attended with a loss of twenty lives. Iquique, the chief port of the province of Tarapaca, was a well-built town, of several thousand inhabitants. It was entirely submerged by the waves. Chala and other seaport towns shared the same fate.

The following is from the "Panama Star:"—"The news in our columns to-day is the most appalling and painful we have ever laid before our readers. Thousands upon thousands of lives have been called instantly into eternity; whole cities, towns, and villages have been swept away from the face of the earth; and ships with their crews have been whirled from their anchorages by the receding sea and swallowed up. Such a picture of general destruction and desolation, extending for hundreds of miles along the coast, and reaching up to the topmost heights of the Andes, can scarcely be imagined. The reader stands aghast with horror in attempting to contemplate and to comprehend the magnitude of the devastation which has occurred. It is impossible to say if the desolation is at an end. There are many points in the interior and further south of which nothing has yet reached us from the Colombian frontier. But, counting only what is known up to the present, the evil extends over more than 200 leagues. More than 300,000 persons have remained without shelter and without bread in consequence of this horrible catastrophe, and with difficulty shall we find in history an instance of a calamity which has embraced such an immense extent of territory."

— **ACCOUCHEMENT OF PRINCESS TECK.**—Her Royal Highness Princess Mary Adelaide was safely delivered of a boy at Kensington Palace at half-past four o'clock a.m. A bulletin signed by Dr. Farre and Mr. E. H. Hills was issued, to the effect that the Princess and her son were doing perfectly well.

— **EXECUTION AT MAIDSTONE.**—This, the first execution under the new Act, by which capital punishment is ordered to be inflicted within the prison walls, took place at Maidstone. The culprit hanged was Thomas Wells, a railway porter at Dover, who was recently convicted of the murder of his immediate superior, the station-master at the Priory station there. The scaffold was erected in a small yard adjoining the debtors' portion of the gaol, which had at one time been used as an exercise-yard for the prisoners. It was inclosed by four high walls. The apparatus was the same that was formerly made use of, with some slight alterations. No one was present at the execution but the undersheriff, governor, surgeon, chaplain, and sixteen representatives of the press.

14. AGRARIAN MURDERS IN TIPPERARY.—A singularly daring and sanguinary agrarian outrage was committed at a place called Ballycoohey, near Limerick Junction, on the borders of the county Tipperary. Mr. William Scully, brother of Mr. Vincent Scully, formerly M.P. for Cork county, while proceeding to execute extensive evictions on his property in that locality, under the protection of a party of five armed policemen, was fired on from one of the farmhouses, at which desperate resistance was offered to the execution of the legal process, and an affray ensued in which two persons were killed.

For the past three months thirty families on his estate in the neighbourhood of Ballycoohey had notice to quit. Early this morning, Mr. Scully, his driver, and one bailiff, escorted by five policemen, proceeded in cars to the scene of the evictions, and the *cortège* was noticed with no friendly feeling as it passed along the road. The demand for possession was made and complied with at several of the farms, but at one farm, held by a family named Dwyer, the occupants deliberately closed the dwelling-house and other premises, and having provided themselves with firearms and ammunition, retired to the barn, and barricaded the entrance. When Mr. Scully and his party arrived they found the place silent and apparently deserted. A formal demand for surrender of the premises was made, when the party in the barn showed themselves, and sternly warned Mr. Scully off. The police were then called on, and on the first demonstration made by them a volley was discharged from the windows of the barn. The bailiff, named Gorman, and Morrough, a constable, were shot dead, and Mr. Scully received two wounds, not of a dangerous character. The four remaining policemen were wounded, and fearing the barn was held by a numerous party, the survivors beat a hasty retreat, leaving their dead companions on the ground. On the police returning

the farmhouse was found quite deserted, its former occupants having availed themselves of the interval to make their escape.

No definite information could be obtained from the neighbouring farmers. No one seemed to know any thing of the outrage. Dogged and impenetrable reticence foiled the investigations of the authorities on every side. A large police force were concentrated in the neighbourhood, and frequent and numerous searches were prosecuted in every place where either a trace of the criminals or of any other compromising matters were suspected to be concealed. The vigilance extended to the junction, which was under close surveillance, and at night every railway passenger was subjected to a personal search.

Mr. Scully was conveyed to his own residence near Dundrum, where he lay under surgical treatment. Nine arrests were made at Ballycoohey, including the Dwyers, owners of the farmhouse, and several boys. The police found in the loft from which the shots were fired a five-barrelled revolver, a blunderbuss, and other firearms, and a bottle half-full of brandy. The shots were discharged from a sort of porthole, and all the doors of the house had been previously barricaded. The police said that twenty shots must have been fired upon the party. At the inquest on the killed, Constable Clery described the affray as having been brought on by Mr. Scully persisting in his service of notices after being advised by the police to desist. The jury found an open verdict, adding that the conduct of Mr. Scully towards the tenantry at Ballycoohey was much to be deprecated, and that the sooner legislative enactments were passed to put a stop to such proceedings the better for the peace and welfare of the country. It appeared that Mr. Scully had offered to several tenants an agreement which contained the most stringent covenants, by which the tenants were to hold from year to year, and the tenancy was to be terminable by a twenty-one days' notice to quit. The entire tenancy refused to accept or execute such a lease; but it was stated that they were satisfied to pay any additional rent that might be demanded. Mr. Scully served some three or four of the tenants, whom he met in Tipperary, with notices to quit, but others left their homes whilst he remained on the land, and as he could find no person in any of the houses, he had to return. He acted with unusual coolness during the affray, and, with the police, returned the fire.

Of those arrested only three were detained, Pat Dwyer, John Dwyer, and Timothy Hefferman. Pat Dwyer was the owner of the house from which the shots were fired.

15. COLLISION IN THE CHANNEL.—The Channel squadron left Portland on the 14th for Ireland, and on the following night, which was dark and stormy, a collision occurred between two first-class ironclads, the "Warrior" running into the "Royal Oak." The "Warrior's" bowsprit and cutwater carried away all the "Royal

Oak's" starboard boats and davits, as well as four chain-plates in the main chains, and tore adrift her lee main rigging, damaged some chain-plates in the mizen chains, and loosened the lee mizen rigging; tore away the bridge and engine-room telegraph, stove in the starboard berthing and channels, carried away one fluke of the stern anchor, and drove the other fluke through the "Royal Oak's" side. The engine-room telegraph, when being torn away, was by the collision turned to "Go-ahead," and, this order being immediately obeyed from the engine-room, added to the confusion, some minutes elapsing before the machinery could be stopped. The vessels were twenty minutes in collision, and were only freed at length by the "Warrior" steaming astern. The "Royal Oak" went on during the night with the squadron, and, through the thickness of the weather could not communicate her damages to the Admiral until the following morning, when she received orders to go to Plymouth to repair damages. The "Warrior" left her figure-head on board the "Royal Oak." No lives were lost, nor was any one injured.

19. THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION AT NORWICH.—The thirty-eighth congress of the British Association for the Advancement of Science began at Norwich.

The following gentlemen were elected presidents of the various sections:—

Section A (Mathematical and Physical Science).—Professor Tyndall, LL.D., F.R.S.

Section B (Chemical Science).—Professor Frankland, F.R.S.

Section C (Geology).—R. A. C. Godwin Austen, Esq., F.R.S., F.G.S.

Section D (Biology).—The Rev. J. M. Berkeley, M.A., F.R.S.

Section E (Geography and Ethnology).—Captain Richards, F.R.S., Hydrographer to the Royal Navy.

Section F (Economic Science and Statistics).—Samuel Brown, Esq., President of the Society of Actuaries.

Section G (Mechanical Science).—G. Bidder, Esq., C.E.

At a general meeting, in the evening, of the association, in the Drill Hall, the Duke of Buccleuch surrendered the president's chair to Dr. Hooker, who delivered the address.

He began by alluding to its being thirty years since he first attended a meeting of the association at Newcastle, in 1838, when it was resolved to induce the Government to send an expedition to the Antarctic circle, which was effected, and he accompanied it, and had a share in the discovery of the Antarctic continent, the Southern Magnetic Poles, the Polar Barrier, and the ice-clad volcanoes of Victoria Land. He stated that he proposed to remark on the great advances made in Botany in the last few years, with a divergence into Darwinism, after which he would allude to the early history of mankind. His first duty as president would be to

introduce to the association the members of the International Congress of Pre-historic Archæology then assembled in Norwich. Next he brought forward the subject of the efforts of a committee of the council to induce the Secretary for India to adopt active measures to obtain reports on the physical form, manners, and customs of the indigenous population of India, and especially of those tribes which are still in the habit of erecting megalithic monuments; and he pointed out that within 300 miles of the capital of British India there is a tribe of semi-savages who erect dolmens, menares, cysts, and cromlechs, almost as gigantic as the Druidical remains of Europe. Some interesting accounts of the habits and customs of this Khasia people of East Bengal were given, and the president next proceeded to detail the proceedings of a committee of the association in reference to obtaining the placing of the natural history collections of the British Museum under one central management, and so arranged that they may be utilized in teaching the elements of zoology and physiology, while some assistance in this regard should be given to provincial and local museums. On the value of museums generally as adjuncts to instruction he dwelt at length. Turning to his own special science, he stated that great advances had been made during the last ten years in the departments of fossil botany and vegetable physiology. The knowledge of coal plants had been chiefly advanced by Geeppert and Unger on the Continent, and Dawson in Canada, and also by Mr. Binney, of Manchester, who had afforded much information on the least understood of the coal measures, known as calamities, which are shown to be members of the family of equisetaceæ. A good deal was next said of the information as to tertiary mines, and on fossil botany generally; while the subject of a series of papers by Mr. Darwin on fertilization of plants, in reference to discoveries in physiological botany, was elaborately expounded, dissertations on primroses and cowslips being specially dwelt upon; and it was stated that the discoveries mentioned had added whole chapters to the principles of botany, and that what Faraday's discoveries were to telegraphy, Darwin's would prove to rural economy. Having thoroughly exhausted this subject, the president next went on to discuss the position now held in the scientific world by Mr. Darwin's theory of the origin of species by natural selection, and contended that the treatise was not, as had been asserted, declining in scientific favour; but, so far from being a thing of the past, was an accepted doctrine with every philosophical naturalist, was elsewhere gaining adherents steadily, and was an avowed favourite with the rising schools of naturalists. This assertion was borne out by elaborate statements and illustrations, by which objections taken to the system on geological, astronomical, physical, and metaphysical grounds were answered. The next phase of the address was devoted to the prospects which the present meeting of the association opened. A new science—that of the early history

of mankind, or pre-historic archæology, including the origin and language of art—had dawned upon the scientific world; and one of its discoveries was, that man had inhabited the earth for many thousands of years before the historic period. At this point the delicate subject of the respective attitudes of religion and science was discussed, and indications given of the desirability and possibility of their being able to walk hand-in-hand together. It was contended that a great number of eminent clergymen of all denominations had adorned science by their writings and religion by their lives, and much was said to prove that professors of religion need not have that fear of science by which many of them seemed to be influenced; and it was urged that there should be a union in the search after truth, as it refers to the spiritual history and condition of mankind, of the archæologist and the religious teacher. After enlarging and insisting on the value of science in establishing new facts and exposing old errors, the president concluded by saying that the bond which unites the physical and the spiritual history of man, and the forces which manifest themselves in the alternate victories of mind and matter in the actions of the individual, are, of all subjects that physics and psychology have revealed to us, the most absorbing and, perhaps, inscrutable. In the investigation of these phenomena is wrapped up the past and the future, the whence and the whither of man's existence; and after a knowledge of these the human soul still yearns and passionately strives.

Dr. Hooker resumed his seat amid loud cheers, and a cordial vote of thanks for his address was moved by Professor Huxley, seconded by Professor Tyndall, and supported by the Mayor of Norwich, who heartily welcomed the association to Norwich.

Other papers were read during the congress by Mr. R. B. Hayward, Mr. Clements Markham, Dr. Henry Blane, Rev. Canon Girdlestone, Professor Leone Levi, Professor Newton, &c.

The business of the association was brought to a close on the 26th, when the concluding meeting was held in St. Peter's Hall. Professor Phillips, in moving a vote of thanks to the Mayor, the local secretaries, and the executive committee, testified to the hospitable manner in which the association had been received by the inhabitants of Norwich. A vote of thanks was also presented to the Bishop of the diocese for having thrown open the cathedral during the visit of the association to the city.

The work of the association being concluded, the members entered upon the more agreeable duties which belong to excursionists. The trips organized were geological visits to Cromer, Lynn, and Hunstanton; archæological inspections of Wolterton Manor House, the remains of the Augustine Monastery at Walsingham, and the Roman camp at Burgh, near Yarmouth; and a convivial entertainment at Holkham Hall, the seat of the Earl of Leicester.

— FIRE AT NORTHUMBERLAND HOUSE.—Northumberland House,

Charing-cross, the town residence of the Duke of Northumberland, was discovered to be on fire in the night; and the ball-room, a spacious and magnificently-decorated apartment, forming the entire wing of the mansion on the west side of the garden front, was nearly destroyed. Workmen had been engaged during the day in cleaning the gilt work, and it is supposed that the fire was occasioned by some carelessness on their part. A superb Sèvres china vase, the gift of Charles X. of France to Duke Hugh of Northumberland, who was Ambassador Extraordinary from the Court of St. James's at the coronation of that monarch, was broken.

20. DREADFUL ACCIDENT TO THE IRISH MAIL TRAIN.—The most terrible railway accident that ever happened in this country—in France and America something like it had occurred before—took place. A passenger train ran into some waggonen laden with barrels of petroleum; the inflammable oil took fire from the engine; thirty-three persons, unable to get out of the carriages, were burnt alive; their bodies were reduced to heaps of cinders. No epithets can add to the horror of such a statement as this. A simple account of the facts will be enough, in this instance, with reference to the disaster.

The Irish day-mail express-train, leaving the Euston-square terminus of the London and North-Western Railway at a quarter-past seven in the morning, was timed to reach Chester at thirty-three minutes past eleven. From Chester to Holyhead is eighty-five miles, and the time allowed to the express for this distance was two hours and five minutes. The train was due at Holyhead by ten minutes to two o'clock. Abergele is about half way between Chester and Holyhead, and the collision happened about two miles beyond Abergele.

This train left Chester thirteen minutes before noon, being eight minutes late, but was again fully up to its time in passing Abergele, twenty minutes before one o'clock. It consisted in all of thirteen carriages, four of which and a van had been attached at Chester. The latter formed the portion of the train nearest to the engine. Next to the guard's van came a composite carriage, made up of first and second class compartments; then followed two first-class carriages, and behind them a second-class and a baggage compartment on the same framework. A post-office van came next; then the travelling post-office itself; then another post-office van; and, lastly, the carriages which had come down from London. One of the four first carriages, a first-class, was specially engaged by Lord Farnham, who had been staying at the Queen Hotel, Chester, and was, with his lady and four servants (namely, house-keeper, valet, butler, and lady's maid), proceeding to Ireland. In the same portion of the train was a party (who also joined the train at Chester), consisting of the Rev. Sir Nicholas Chinnery, Bart., Lady Chinnery, two ladies, and a maid-servant, Judge Berwick (of the Dublin Court of Bankruptcy) and sister, and

others. Then came two post-office tenders, and immediately after, in a first-class carriage, the Duchess of Abercorn, two daughters, three sons, and suite, who were also travelling to Ireland.

For some time before coming to Abergele the line runs close to the sea-shore. To the right of the down train is the sea; to the left, a picturesque range of the Welsh hills, beautifully wooded.

From Abergele station as far as Llanddulas, a mile and a half, is an ascent of about 1 in 90, and on this incline the collision happened.

There was a goods-train which left Chester about half an hour before the mail, and which it was customary to shunt, according to the direction of the local officials, either at Pensaen or Llanddulas—more frequently at the latter place. The operation of shunting was being performed on this day about one o'clock, at the top of the incline at Llanddulas. Some of the intermediate waggons between the engine and the rear van had to be shunted. The five or six waggons nearest to the van were uncoupled from the rest of the train and left on the main line, while the others were backed into the siding. The guard descended during this operation, as was his duty, but was supposed to have put on the break. When the engine had put the other waggons into the siding it came out again on the main line and backed, so as to meet the waggons which it had left there. The moment it came into contact with them, and before a coupling could be effected, they rolled back, and, increasing in velocity as they descended, kept running down the incline till they were encountered by the express. Some one on foot ran after, but was unable to overtake them. They had run down about a mile when the express-train met them.

Arthur Thompson, the driver of the express, gave a very collected account of what he witnessed. His train was going up the incline at a moderate pace, about thirty miles an hour. He said that he did not see the waggons till his train was within a few yards of them—not more than the distance of the width of the railway; and seeing that there were barrels of oil, though not knowing of what particular kind the oil was, he resolved at once to jump off the engine. Before leaping, he said to the fireman, Joseph Holmes, "Joe, jump off." He himself, having jumped off on the embankment side, alighted on his feet, but was struck with a fragment of the guard's van, next the tender, which threw him down on the embankment. He rose to his feet again, though suffering from wounds in the head, hand, and knee, and perceived that the tender had gone right over the engine, and that the van and foremost carriages were on fire. He rushed to the back carriages, assisted in uncoupling them from the rest of the train, and handed a carriage-key to a tall gentleman who was standing on the steps of a carriage. In an instant after Thompson had handed him the key he observed that the carriage on the steps of which the gentleman had been standing was in a blaze. He

never saw that gentleman again. He heard a cry from under the engine, which he believed to have been uttered by Joe Holmes, his mate. Thompson stated that the blaze spread from carriage to carriage with the rapidity of lightning, and that there was no going near a carriage when once it caught fire. He and other persons who witnessed the accident agreed in stating positively that not a shriek, a moan, or a cry proceeded from any one in the blazing carriages, and that no one in any of them made an attempt to get out. It is thought they were suffocated by the fumes of the burning petroleum, or stupefied by the explosion.

One of the passengers, the Marquis of Hamilton (eldest son of the Duke of Abercorn, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland), gave the following account:—"We were startled by a collision and a shock which, though not very severe, were sufficient to throw every one against his opposite neighbour. I immediately jumped out of the carriage, when a fearful sight met my view. Already the whole of the three passenger-carriages in front of ours, the vans, and the engine were enveloped in dense sheets of flame and smoke, rising fully twenty feet high, and spreading out in every direction; it was the work of an instant. No words can convey the instantaneous nature of the explosion and conflagration. I had actually got out almost before the shock of the collision was over, and this was the spectacle which already presented itself. Not a sound, not a scream, not a struggle to escape, or a movement of any sort was apparent in the doomed carriages. It was as though an electric flash had at once paralyzed and stricken every one of their occupants. So complete was the absence of any presence of living or struggling life in them that, as soon as the passengers from the other parts of the train were in some degree recovered from their first shock and consternation, it was imagined that the burning carriages were destitute of passengers; a hope soon changed into feelings of horror when their contents of charred and mutilated remains were discovered about an hour afterwards. From the extent, however, of the flames, the suddenness of the conflagration, and the absence of any power to extricate themselves, no human aid would have been of any assistance to the sufferers, who, in all probability, were instantaneously suffocated by the black and fetid smoke peculiar to paraffin, which rose in volumes around the spreading flames."

All accounts stated that the collision itself was not very severe. The driver said that so little did he expect it would be so, even after seeing the trucks, that he would not have leapt off the engine if he had not seen there was oil on the trucks. The boiler of the engine did not burst. The buffers of the engine were smashed by their coming in contact with the trucks, and the tender, in its somersault, broke off both the valve pillars. The collision must have occurred about a quarter to one o'clock, but the line for a length of forty or fifty yards was in a sea of flame till nearly eight o'clock in the evening, owing to the petroleum being spread over it, and

despite the exertions of a number of men who kept throwing buckets of water on it. The ballast between the rails, having become saturated with the petroleum, burnt fiercely, and the rails themselves became red-hot. Neither the engine nor the carriages of the express were overturned, but the waggons were thrown off the line with such violence that they knocked down portions of a strong stone wall bounding the line on the side next the sea. The noise of the collision was not heard at any great distance, but the flames were seen far and wide.

Six carriages and a luggage-van were uncoupled by the wounded driver Thompson, and drawn away by an engine which fortunately came from the direction of Abergele before the flames had extended to them. In one of these rear carriages the Duchess of Abercorn's party were. The second post-office tender was liberated by a foreman platelayer, named Dickens; but the large van and all the carriages, down to and including the post-office van, were consumed, with every person in them. The post-office clerks, on perceiving the fire, began throwing out the mail-bags from the front of their van; and the connexion between it and the remaining part of the train was broken by the railway officials, post-office men, and passengers, who undid the couplings and cut the wide leather bands which passed from the van to the post-office itself.

It was observed that, during the journey from London to Chester, the first compartment of the carriage next the engine was occupied by the Duchess of Abercorn, Ladies Georgiana and Maud Hamilton, the Marquis of Hamilton, and Lords Ernest and Frederick. At Chester two or three carriages were interposed between that in which the Lord-Lieutenant's family were and the engine. Unhappily, Lord and Lady Farnham and two young ladies were travelling in those Chester carriages; they were burnt to death. The Marquis of Hamilton acted with much presence of mind and energy. He was active in assisting the passengers to get out of the carriages, and it was owing to him principally that the up Irish express from Holyhead was stopped, and so another collision prevented. Probably this was the only very disastrous railway accident in which there were no wounded, with the exception of one individual. It was death in a most dreadful form or entire escape.

The removal of the charred remains of the dead was the most painful sight that can be conceived. One shapeless trunk after another was taken up, removed to the embankment, and covered with a piece of canvas, until fragments believed to represent thirty-three human beings (though for a long time the number was doubtful) were collected and removed by train to Abergele. Coffins had been received from Chester which sufficed for the reception of eleven bodies; six other bodies were placed in wooden boxes, such as were readily obtainable; and the remainder, six in number, were covered with canvas. The whole were deposited,

pending the inquest, in a room beneath the tower of St. Michael's Church, Abergyle. The spectacle of so many human bodies in a state which placed them utterly beyond recognition was sickening. One, that of Lord Farnham, was identified by the watch he wore, which bore his crest. Lady Farnham's identity was likewise placed beyond dispute by her watch, and her body lay close to that of her husband. Not one of the bodies retained the slightest trace of individual features. Their faces were all destroyed. It was difficult for the surgeons, Drs. Lloyd, Griffiths, and Jones to distinguish the sex of each. They discovered that in many cases portions of the remains of two different persons had been gathered together as parts of one corpse. In no case were there feet or legs, nor was there any thing like a perfect head. In one of the coffins were remains in two or three different pieces. One of these was a jaw with some whisker attached. The small portion of flesh which remained was like black leather. After a long and apparently careful examination, the three surgeons drew up a report. The following is a sample of the entries respecting each skeleton:—"No. 1. Female body; skull partially consumed, one tooth remaining in upper jaw only; pelvis intact, containing all the organs in a perfect state of preservation from fire. A portion of a silk dress found under the right armpit, between it and the body, recovered unburnt. The body is supposed to be that of Lady Farnham." And so on for thirty-three cases—in no instance the body being in a more recognizable condition. The following was the result of the examination:—Males, 10; females, 13; sex unknown, 10: total, 33. When it was found that identification of the remains was in every case out of the question, inquirers went to the police station to view the articles found on the site of the accident. The collection was very miscellaneous, but of great value. It included diamonds of extraordinary size and singular brilliancy. There were a magnificent diamond necklace, a costly diamond ring, a centre ornament of a tiara, having one large diamond and eleven others, not much smaller. There were rubies, opals, emeralds, gold tops of smelling-bottles, opera-glasses, twenty-four watches (all, with two or three exceptions, gold), chains, clasps of bags, and very many bunches of keys. The diamonds stood the fire better than any thing else; the settings were nearly destroyed, but the stones remained unimpaired. The present Lord Farnham, his brother the Hon. Richard Maxwell, and some of the servants of the late Lord, made a lengthened inspection of these articles; and they were able to give all but equal proof that some of the most valuable jewels—the diamonds especially—had been the property of the late Lord and Lady Farnham. One jewel Lord Farnham recognized as the badge of the Order of St. Patrick. His late brother had worn it at the inauguration of the Prince of Wales as a Knight of that order. Then, a pair of gold links were found, with a coronet and the initials "A. F. F.," her Ladyship's Christian names having been

Anna Francisca. A watch bearing his Lordship's crest was in the collection.

The inquest was opened on the 24th, in the Town-hall of Abergele, by Dr. Evan Pierce, Coroner for that division of Denbighshire; but little could be done, and it was adjourned till the 26th, when Lieutenant-Colonel Rich, one of the inspectors of railways under the Board of Trade was present. The London and North-Western Railway Company was represented by Mr. Roberts, from the solicitor's office, Euston-square terminus; Mr. Mason, assistant manager; Mr. Binger, and Mr. Lee. Lord Farnham, the Hon. R. S. Maxwell, and the Hon. W. Maxwell, brothers of the late Lord Farnham; Sir Henry Edwardes, M.P., whose brother, Captain Edwardes, was among the dead; Major Waterhouse, brother-in-law to Captain Edwardes, with several other mourners, were present.

The verdict of the jury was one of "Manslaughter" against Richard Williams, the senior brakeman, and Robert Jones, the junior brakeman, of the goods-train. They added, "We cannot refrain from strongly censuring the conduct of the Llanddulas station-master for gross dereliction of duty in non-observance of a rule of the company which requires 'that all goods-trains must be shunted at stations on sideways at least ten minutes before a passenger-train is due.' We regret to find how carelessly several of the company's rules are enforced by those having the supervision of the working of the company. We recommend that a longer time should be given to a 'pick-up train' to go through the process of shunting trains for a passenger-train to pass, especially on an incline like that at Llanddulas; and that, during the process of shunting, the points should be opened into a siding behind the brake-van, thereby preventing runaway trucks from travelling down inclines on main lines. We are satisfied that the doors of the carriages were not locked on the platform side of the Irish down mail on the day in question." The jury expressed an opinion that the persons killed were suffocated, and not burned to death, and offered their sympathy to the surviving friends of the victims. The brakemen at once surrendered, and were committed for trial by the Coroner, but allowed bail.

The interment of all the remains together in Abergele churchyard took place at ten o'clock on the morning of the 25th. The Rev. James Meredith, Rector of the parish, and the Rev. James Taylor, of Bamberbridge, near Preston, officiated in the funeral service. Many relatives of the deceased, including several ladies, attended the sad ceremony. A crowd of people, whose behaviour showed the utmost reverence and sympathy, waited outside the gates. One vast grave had been dug, in which more than thirty coffins were laid side by side, at a depth of seven or eight feet. It was a very affecting scene.

22. DESTRUCTIVE GALE.—A gale swept over the coast during the night causing great disasters. The ship "Tara," which sailed

from Liverpool in the course of the day, was totally lost off the mouth of the Mersey, and, while the captain was saved (he died since of the injuries he received), twenty-three persons were supposed to have been drowned. Two other vessels, names unknown, ran ashore near the same place. In the afternoon a fine brig proceeding from the westward was caught in the gale off Portland, and went down so suddenly with all hands on board that it was impossible to learn either her name or any particulars respecting her. It was estimated that there were twelve total wrecks off the Mersey, and about a hundred lives lost. Information was received by Mr. Edward Oliver, of North Shields, owner of the brig "Albion," that that vessel had been lost, and with her the whole of the crew, with the exception of one boy. The captain's wife and two children were on board, and they also were drowned. On the Cornish coast, in the night, the "Jules Joup-lone," from Llanelly for La Rochelle, was driven from the Land's End towards Padstow, near which port she was wrecked, and went to pieces very soon after. Her crew, four in number, were rescued by the life-boat. In many other cases the boats of the National Life-Boat Institution—sent, as usual, promptly to the rescue—did good service. The gale also extended to France, where there were not only great shipping disasters, but loss of property on land, caused by the violence of the wind and inundations.

25. INTERNATIONAL YACHT RACE.—A grand challenge yacht race round the Isle of Wight, by the American clipper yacht Sappho and the English yachts Condor, Oimara, Aline, and Cambria, resulted in favour of the latter vessel. The yachts left Cowes roads at 10 a.m., proceeding eastward on making the Needles passage. They had a fine leading wind up the West Channel, and, after a splendid and exciting race between the four English yachts (the American being some ten miles behind) arrived off the clubhouse at Cowes in the evening, in the following order:—Cambria, schooner, at 6.17; Aline, schooner, at 6.19; Oimara, cutter, at 6.22; Condor, cutter, at 6.25; and the American schooner Sappho, at 7.55. The Cambria is Cowes built, the Aline Gosport built, and the Oimara and Condor are Scotch built. The Sappho, built at New York, was a much larger vessel than her competitors, being of above 300 tons burden; but no allowance of time was made. Her owner was Mr. W. H. Lawton. She did not certainly perform so well as was expected of her.

SEPTEMBER.

3. LAUNCH OF THE BERMUDA FLOATING DOCK.—The Board of Admiralty, having determined to provide an iron floating dock at Bermuda, especially for the purpose of cleaning the bottoms of Her Majesty's ships in the West Indian squadron, engaged Messrs. Campbell, Johnson, and Co., of Silvertown, North Woolwich, to construct one larger than any previously made elsewhere. Its dimensions are 381 feet in length, 123 feet 9 inches in extreme breadth, and a total depth of 74 feet 5 inches. At a distance of 24 feet from each end caissons enclose a dock space of 333 feet in length, by 83 feet 9 inches in width, which will receive a vessel of 3000 tons. The section of the dock is of a U form throughout, except at the extreme ends, where, for the convenience of towing, there is a slight taper. The sides are formed of a cellular labyrinth of water-tight compartments twenty feet in thickness, intersected by "ribs," "stiffeners," and "girders," and forming a huge mass of iron plating that is held together by three millions of rivets. The dock is from a design of Mr. Campbell, the principal partner in the firm, which was at once adopted by Colonel Clarke, R.E., Director of Works to the Board of Admiralty.

The first attempt to launch this huge structure was made on the preceding day. A numerous company, amongst whom were Lord Henry Lennox, Viscount Curzon; the Hon. F. Stanley, the newly-appointed Lord of the Admiralty; Admiral Sir Alexander Milne; and Rear-Admiral Wellesley, Superintendent of Portsmouth Dockyard, assembled to see the operation performed. The wife of Colonel Clarke, assisted by Miss Campbell; daughter of the builder, cut the cord suspending the weight which knocked away the dog-shores, and smashed a bottle of wine, suspended by ribbons, against the side of the floating dock; but the huge mass of iron remained stolidly unmoved. Two powerful hydraulic presses commenced pumping; but the only response was a slight straining and cracking of the stout baulks of timber, communicating their thrust to the "cradles." Gangs of men then improvised battering-rams of short lengths of square timber and cords, and tried to drive the great thing into the water; but no perceptible movement took place, and the Bermuda, with 8350 tons of dead weight, remained in the same situation during half an hour of industrious effort to set her going. As a last resource, hundreds of shipwrights, working simultaneously, hammered wedges under the cradles, in the hope of giving her the little start that alone was required to send her gliding down the ways into the muddy waters of the Thames. As this effort was not productive of the desired effect, the proceedings had to be suspended.

The cause of the difficulty was the enormous pressure upon the ways. So great was that pressure that all atmospheric air was excluded from the interstices, and as a consequence this "dock," and the ways upon which she was placed, became as one solid mass. The problem was to produce mobility in the grease by the admission of air. To effect this, previously to the second attempt, notches were cut at intervals in the "ribbons," or planks which bound the "ways" on each side; the grease was scraped away with long probes pushed in through the openings thus made, and fresh oil was squirted in with syringes. A separation was thus effected, and all that then remained to be done was to give the huge mass of nearly 10,000 tons of iron its initial push. A scientific consultation was held in the yard, at which were present Messrs. Barnes, Warren, and Crossland, from the Admiralty, and Mr. Lumley, a Thames shipbuilder of great experience; and, in obedience to the recommendation of those gentlemen, upwards of sixty "shores" were placed against the bilge of the vessel on her inner side, and at the bottom of these shores were placed wedges, which were driven in by the united force of a thousand men. In addition, the services of eleven hydraulic "jacks" were called into requisition; and the application of all this force, supplementing the previous ventilation and lubrication of the ways, sent the great vessel in about half a minute into the river; and in a few minutes afterwards she was under full way, bound for Sheerness.

— THE AMERICAN MINISTER AT SHEFFIELD.—The annual feast of the Sheffield Cutlers' Company was held in their new hall, under the presidency of Mr. Mark Firth, Master Cutler. A distinguished company was present. The meeting was remarkable from the attendance and speech of Mr. Reverdy Johnson, the new representative of the American Government at the Court of St. James's.

Mr. J. J. Smith proposed "His Excellency the Hon. Reverdy Johnson, Minister of the United States," who, he said, was celebrated in the Senate and Cabinet of his own country, and came to England welcomed with confidence only equalled by that with which he was greeted by his own countrymen. *

The toast was drunk with cheers.

Mr. Johnson, on rising, was received with applause, which was several times repeated.

He said,—“I came to your country as a messenger of peace. That messenger I mean to be. I could not be otherwise if I carried out the instructions of my Government. I value your reception the more because it assures me, in addition to the assurances which I have heard since I have landed upon your shores, that you entertain a friendly feeling for the Government and the people of the United States, and I am most happy to assure you, my lords and gentlemen, that that feeling is warmly reciprocated. I speak only what I know, with every opportunity of becoming acquainted with the sentiments of my country. I know that for no people on

the habitable globe is there a kinder feeling entertained by those of the United States than for the subjects of Her Majesty. We are, in fact, by origin and by institutions, one people. We have a common name, kindred, blood, similar privileges, and equal protection; and these, in the language of one of your philosophic statesmen, who taught the world what it was to be just and right, 'are ties stronger than links of iron.' During the domestic troubles which agitated our land, and which brought to almost every household sorrow and death, differences of opinion were entertained, and it was not therefore to be wondered at that differences prevailed here in England as to the causes and the justice of the struggle in which we were engaged; but the struggle now, thank God, is at an end. Our differences have disappeared, and I rejoice to believe, and every day of the short days that I have lived with you satisfies me that I am justified in believing, that all such differences here have disappeared. We have become convinced that we must be one and indivisible. Nature, by her mountain, and her river, and her ocean, has proclaimed to us that we must be one; and I beg you to be assured that as we are one, that very unity will increase our prosperity and power. Our political institutions are like yours; they are fashioned from yours, and in their foundation lies a deep and never-dying attachment to human liberty. In our land—I mean in our joint land—that liberty will live for ever." These sentiments were received with loud and prolonged cheering. Mr. Johnson went on to express his thankfulness that the American war had destroyed slavery; and in reference to the Presidential contest, said, "I beg to assure you, from my knowledge of both candidates, that, whichever shall be the choice of the people, you will find a friend of England."

Mr. Roebuck was also present, and delivered his views in a characteristic speech.

The Sheffield Town Council, the next day, presented an address to Mr. Reverdy Johnson, congratulating him on his appointment as United States Minister, and expressing the best wishes of the Corporation that peace may be ever preserved between America and this country. An address similar in purport was also presented by the Master Cutler. Mr. Johnson, in replying, heartily reciprocated the friendly sentiments which both documents conveyed.

4. FIRE IN SOUTHAMPTON DOCKS.—A fire, by which damage was done to the amount of 40,000*l.*, took place in the premises of the Royal Mail Steam-packet Company, in Southampton Docks. It began soon after the men left work in the evening, in the carpenters' pattern-shop. This workshop, situated at the south-western angle of the block of buildings comprising the factory, was bounded on the north by the engineers' factory, on the north-east by the immense boiler-house, and on the south-east by the brass foundry and the factory offices. The flames spread rapidly

in every direction, and communicated speedily with the engineers' shop, and thence to a heap of coal, containing as much as 1500 tons, which was standing in the factory yard. The engineers' shop contained an immense stock of valuable plant, as well as a large number of workmen's tools, which have either been destroyed or rendered useless. The flames spread to the boiler-house of the Southampton Sugar Refinery, which adjoins the Royal Mail Company's premises. This boiler-house was a large building, with thick brick walls, and with the roof strengthened by immense piers; and, though containing nothing of a very inflammable character, had within it a number of boring and punching machines and other property of a valuable nature. The roof communication was cut off, and the Royal Mail Company's hose was stationed inside the house and confined the fire on that side to the engineers' shop. By the use of many fire-engines playing for two or three hours the fire was so far got under as to be confined to the total destruction of the pattern shop, the engineers' shop, and the brass foundry, on the Royal Mail Company's premises, and the boiler-house at the sugar factory. There was no accident to life or limb, although the fire extended over an area of some acres.

5. MURPHY RIOTS AT MANCHESTER.—Mr. Murphy, the notorious lecturer against Roman Catholicism, succeeded in defeating the precautions taken by the Manchester magistrates for the preservation of the peace. This afternoon one of the most serious riots occurred in the south-western suburbs of the city which have been known for years, arising out of causes having a religious or political character, and led to the arrest of over thirty of the combatants. Early in the week Mr. Murphy was arrested, on arriving in the town to lecture, upon a warrant granted on information sworn before the magistrates that, if he was allowed to lecture, a serious breach of the peace was apprehended. He was taken before the magistrates and held to bail, two clergymen becoming sureties for his good behaviour. Upon these, and his own recognizances for 200*l.*, he was liberated from Belle Vue (the city) gaol on the 3rd. He was no sooner at liberty than he took steps to defeat the intention of the magistrates. Knowing how sensitive the public mind is to any attempt at fettering the liberty of speech during an election, he issued an address to the electors of Manchester, offering himself as a candidate at the next election on Protestant principles. After this he issued another placard, calling an open-air meeting in Chorlton-road of electors this afternoon.

On the meeting ground, accordingly, there was a dense crowd of people assembled by about four o'clock, and soon afterwards a waggon, containing a number of Mr. Murphy's friends, was drawn into the midst of them. These persons were received with great cheering by a large proportion of the crowd. A Mr. Leatham was voted to the chair, and addressed the meeting. Mr. Teare then moved a resolution to the effect that the conduct of the magistrates in arresting Murphy was unconstitutional, and

calling upon the Home Secretary to institute an inquiry into their conduct. While this speaker was addressing the meeting there came up Chorlton-road a formidable phalanx of Irishmen, who joined the meeting and proceeded to distribute themselves around the outer edge of the gathering. Almost immediately after their arrival a collision ensued. Both parties appeared to be provided for such a contingency, and sticks and stones were freely used. The combatants fought with fierce determination for a considerable time. A number of detective policemen in plain clothes had mingled in the meeting; but as there were 5000 or 6000 persons present, they could do little to stop the riot, though what they did attempt was vigorously done. Before this scene of lawless violence and tumult had lasted long, however, a large body of city police, which had been held in reserve, was marched upon the ground and proceeded to make a number of arrests. By that time the commotion had spread along Chorlton-road and Stretford-New-road, and a tolerably free fight was extending itself into the rather populous outskirts of the city; and fears began to be entertained of a more serious issue than had been contemplated even by the magistrates. The police, however, acted vigorously and with good effect.

Up to this time Murphy had not arrived, but soon after five o'clock he made his appearance on the waggon, and was vociferously cheered by the meeting, among whom were a great number of Orangemen. He addressed the assembly, and his address was of a character to have produced great exasperation, had it not been for the presence of such a large and restraining body of police. The Irish were still mainly on the outer borders of the meeting, and frequently shook their fists when Murphy made any allusion to their religion that was particularly objectionable, manifesting a disposition to renew the combat that had been arrested partly by the police and partly out of a feeling excited by his arrival on the ground. When Murphy had concluded, a vote of confidence in him and adopting him as a fit and proper person to represent the Protestant interest in Parliament was passed. Three cheers were then given for the Crown, and three cheers for William, Prince of Orange, followed by three groans for Popery.

The National Anthem was sung at the close, and Murphy was then carried shoulder-high out of the reach of danger. At the corner of Moss-lane he was put into a cab and driven off rapidly.

A great number of broken heads were the result of the fight, and a good deal of blood flowed, but no one was mortally injured. Several policemen were roughly used and received contusions. Thirty-one persons were taken into custody, chiefly Irishmen.

Mr. Clarke, magistrate, and Captain Palin were on the ground, and about 100 policemen of the D division of the city, under the command of Superintendent Rooking. About twenty of the county constabulary, under Superintendent Bent, also were present, and rendered good service in arresting violence in the streets.

Two of the ringleaders of the Irish were among those arrested, and also a man who fired a pistol at a body of police while they were marching down Chester-road. The shots had happily missed taking effect. The pistol was said to have been aimed deliberately, and the man was arrested immediately after firing as he was attempting to escape by running.

On the following afternoon a party of Irishmen made an attempt to renew the violence of the previous day, by attacking groups of people in Chorlton-road. The police prevented any renewal of fighting, and took eleven persons into custody.

— STRIKE AMONG THE LONDON CABMEN.—The London cab proprietors and drivers, as they had previously intimated, left the metropolis without cabs plying about the streets. A week before the assembled "trade" had determined to strike against the public if the grievances with the railway companies, with which the public had nothing to do, were not redressed; these grievances being that only privileged cabs were allowed on the private stands of the companies to take up the incoming traffic. As the railway companies were quite careless as to whatever steps the cab proprietors and drivers might take, the strike was made as complete as possible, and, generally speaking, none but privileged cabs were to be seen in the metropolis. The streets in all parts of the metropolis had an unwonted appearance, and looked almost deserted in the morning. Regent-street and the west-end generally, down to the Strand, presented a clear road for traffic, but in the city itself the strike was not so general, there being in the streets and even on some stands some non-privileged cabs complying with the spirit and letter of the Act of Parliament by plying for hire. There were plenty of the privileged cabs at the stations, and the strike cabmen gathered about the station doors to watch for any cases of inconvenience which might arise. If there were any such cases, they were few, especially to incoming passengers, and the on-lookers had the mortification of seeing that their services could be dispensed with. Others of the strike cabmen drove about the streets in carts heralded by a trumpeter, and this procession made a point of hooting at every cabman found out with his vehicle. When the procession came to any unprivileged cab a point was made of taking the number of the cab, and, if possible, of the man, with a view of making out a sort of "black list" in the future. The drivers on strike assembled on Primrose-hill in the evening, when the form of a meeting was gone through. The speakers were chiefly those who had previously addressed the meeting at the Agricultural Hall, and the subjects dilated upon were the tyranny of the railway companies, the hard necessities of the cabmen, the impossibility of their earning the means of livelihood and the money the masters demand, with railway stands closed against them.

This resolution was passed, "That we, the cabdrivers of London, on account of the unfair treatment and refusal of the various

railway companies to throw open their stations to us, are reluctantly, but fully determined not to take out any proprietors' cabs until such times as these railways are open to each and all of us. This resolution to take effect from this day."

The cab proprietors, it was said, were supporting the men on strike, looking for a return in an increased call upon their men when work should be resumed. But the railway companies were too strong for any such combination as this; the cost of maintaining it was too great, and the small masters, who naturally most felt the pinch of the strike, were the first to renounce it, and many of their cabs plied for hire as usual. On the 9th, at a meeting of delegates from the amalgamated association, after much talk about recruiting strength for another and deadlier strike, a resolution was moved, declaring that for the present the cabs would resume work, but would not ply at the railway stations; and after a prolonged discussion, adjourned till the evening, the resolution was passed. On the 10th, therefore, the cabs were again on the stands.

8. PRIVATE EXECUTION IN NEWGATE.—The first private execution in London was carried into effect with all its dread solemnities within the walls of Newgate, when Alexander Arthur Mackay, a lad of nineteen, was hanged for the murder of his mistress, Emma Grossmith.

About this painful event there is little to record, beyond the absence, if we may so term it, of the usual execution incidents. What did occur was sad enough for those who had to witness it, and who from the very paucity of their number, not much more than twelve, seemed by their very presence to be aiding in carrying out the last great judgment of human law. Nothing could be more striking than the aspect of Newgate, as contrasted with what it used to be when executions were public. There was no uproar, there were no barriers, and, above all, there was no wolfish crowd of thieves and prostitutes waiting to see a man die; the catcalls, the bonnetings; the preachings of ministers, whose every word used to be interrupted by obscenity and blasphemy, the wild jumping dances to profane choruses were all absent. There was not even a policeman, the windows opposite the gaol were all untenanted; and in these days, when people get compensation for all improvements, it is almost wonderful that the owners or occupiers of these houses did not apply for some indemnity for the loss they suffered from the criminals being hanged in private. Newgate-street, or, at least, that part of it in front of the Old Bailey, was almost empty. A little group of people, not 100 in all, were standing watching the great gaunt flagstaff at the base of which lay a mass of black—the black flag which was to be hoisted when the culprit fell and remain hoisted while he was hanging. Beyond this there was nothing. Within the prison, too, all was just as usual, except that there was nothing of uproar to break the gloomy silence of its thick stone walls. The very few

representatives of the Press who were present were admitted at half-past eight, and passed at once to what is called the chapel-yard—a little quadrangle in the interior of the prison. In the corner of this an adapted scaffold was erected, and round it a little black barrier, outside which those whose duty compelled them to be present were stationed. Beyond this was another barrier, or rather black line of demarcation, within which some half-a-dozen policemen were stationed, but this was all. In this spot all waited in a silence which was, if we may so term it, almost painful from its intensity. There was none of the surging roar of the crowd outside which used to pour within the sullen walls of the gaol, and make an execution so hideous, but in its stead a terrible stillness.

At a quarter to nine the bell of St. Sepulchre's began to toll. During this time the criminal was pinioned and left alone with the Chaplain for a few minutes, and then the great bell of Newgate kept dreadful chorus with that of St. Sepulchre's. Amid the knell of these Mackay came out of his cell, and, with the Chaplain, at once passed along the passages, a door at the end of which led direct to the scaffold. Up these few steps he walked with great firmness, and, indeed, seemed absorbed in nothing but prayer. The time on the scaffold was somewhat longer than seemed necessary, but at last the drop fell with a great boom. The sufferings of the murderer were dreadful, but on this we will not dwell, except in so far as to say that in the opinion of those present the fall given was not sufficient to secure instantaneous death. The Sheriffs, the governor of the gaol, and the chief warders attended, with Mr. Gibson, the chief surgeon, and Mr. Lloyd Jones, the Ordinary. After hanging an hour, the body was cut down and officially pronounced to be dead.

Later in the day, in conformity with a provision in the new statute, an inquest was held before Mr. Payne, the deputy coroner for the city, and a jury, at which the identity of the body and the mode of death were established in evidence, as a preliminary to its burial in lime within the precincts of the prison.

11. RETURN OF THE QUEEN FROM SWITZERLAND.—The Queen, accompanied by Princess Louisa, Prince Leopold, and Princess Beatrice, left Lucerne at 8 p.m. on the 9th, upon her return to England. The suite in attendance consisted of the Marchioness of Ely, Major-General Sir T. M. and the Hon. Lady Biddulph, Colonel Ponsonby, the Rev. R. Duckworth, and Dr. Minter. The Dowager Queen of Prussia met the Queen at the railway, and took leave of Her Majesty. A large number of spectators had assembled to witness the departure of the Queen, but the utmost order prevailed. Her Majesty travelled in the Emperor's saloon-carriage by a special train, proceeding, via Basle, Mulhouse, and Belfort, to Troyes. The goods-station at Belfort was burning as the imperial train passed through. The Queen partook of breakfast at Troyes, and afterwards proceeded to Paris, arriving at the Eastern Railway

station on the morning of the 10th. The Queen was received at the station by Lord Lyons, who accompanied Her Majesty to the British Embassy. Later in the day the Queen visited St. Cloud, and was deeply affected by the remembrance of her former sojourn there with the Prince Consort. The Queen walked in the grounds, but did not enter the apartments. During the day Her Majesty received a telegram from the Emperor Napoleon, who was at the camp at Châlons, in which his Imperial Majesty offered his congratulations upon the Queen's arrival in good health, and gave her welcome. Her Majesty responded by telegraph, thanking the Emperor for his attention, and sent a complimentary greeting to the Empress. The Duke of Cambridge, who was at that time in Paris, called at the Embassy, but he did not see the Queen, Her Majesty not having returned from St. Cloud. The Queen dined at the Embassy, and afterwards proceeded to the St. Lazare station, and left Paris at ten o'clock, en route for Cherbourg. Her Majesty travelled in the imperial train as heretofore. The chief railway officials in attendance were in full dress, as were also those who accompanied the train, together with Dr. Bergier, the chief physician to the railway company, who travelled in the train. The utmost quiet prevailed among those who were admitted to the station. Her Majesty took leave of Lord Lyons, and the train proceeded on its route. A stay of a few minutes was made upon the journey at the stations of Evreux, Lisieux, Caen, Bayeux, and Volognes. The Queen arrived at Cherbourg at half-past six on the following morning, and embarked immediately on board the royal yacht "Alberta," and proceeded to the royal yacht "Victor and Albert," Commander the Prince of Leiningen. At nine o'clock the yacht steamed off for Portsmouth, arriving thither at two o'clock. At half-past three the Queen proceeded by special train over the South-Western and Great Western Railways to Windsor, arriving at six o'clock. A large number of the inhabitants had assembled at the station to welcome Her Majesty upon her return, whose greetings the Queen graciously acknowledged. Her Majesty drove to the castle. The whole of the travelling arrangements throughout the journey from Lucerne were made under the direction of Monsieur Kanne, of the Queen's household.

The first message by the Anglo-Danish Telegraph was received in England by the Queen in the evening from the King of Denmark. It was as follows:—"Bernstorff, 7.30 p.m., Sept. 11, 1868.—Christian R. to the Queen, Windsor Castle.—I avail myself with sincere pleasure of the new established direct communication between our countries to congratulate you on your safe return home." The Queen replied to the King of Denmark by the Anglo-Danish cable in the following terms:—"I thank you very much for your kind congratulation."

Her Majesty, accompanied by Princess Louisa, Prince Leopold, and Princess Beatrice, left Windsor Castle on the 14th for Balmoral.

25. FATAL DISASTER AT HULL.—A deplorable accident took place at Hull, when eight men and boys were killed by the fall of a building in Lime-street, called the Old Sugar House, which was used by Messrs. Walker and Smith for the storage of linseed. This old warehouse was the first prominent object which met the eye of a person entering Lime-street at the south end. It was a large and apparently dilapidated pile of brick, and was built in 1731. Its dimensions were stated as seventy-nine feet in length, forty-six feet in breadth, and seventy-four feet in height, and it is said to have had 138 windows. The building was used as a sugar-refining house by Messrs. Thornton, Watson, and Co.; but that business had not been carried on for the last twenty-one years. The building was divided into what may be called the double house and the single house. To the former was attached a six-storied building, used as a cooperage lately, but formerly for filtering. The double house was on the south side, and was stored with grain, of which the quantity was variously estimated. There were several contradictory statements with reference to the number of persons engaged on the premises at the time of the accident; but it seems pretty certain that there were about twenty men and boys in the building, seven of whom were engaged in the cooperage. Eight were killed by the fall of the building, five of them being coopers.

Many theories were put forward to account for the fall of the building. It was said that the timbers were unsound; but this was denied, and the premises were inspected only two or three days before. Within the same week another gentleman examined the upper story, and found no appearance which would justify the assumption that the foundation had given way. His impression was that the rooms had been filled too much with grain, and that the seed escaping into the lower rooms increased the bulk to such an extent that the flooring had burst, and at last the wall was forced out. This theory seemed to derive much probability from the statements made by eye-witnesses of the calamity. It was said that the upper rooms seemed momentarily suspended in the air, whilst the lower rooms fell bodily. The most singular circumstance was that the disaster was indicated beforehand for some minutes by the seed falling out of the windows. This circumstance was immediately noticed and communicated to those who worked on the premises; and it seemed that the men were leaving the premises at the time the building fell. The coopers were nearest the main entrance, and as soon as they heard the loud rumbling that unmistakably warned them of the disaster they made for the door, but ere they could escape the upper part of the structure fell with an awful crash upon the cooperage, and they were buried beneath the ruins.

The names of the seven men dead were Watkinson, Rodman, Hombler, Harrison, and Gillett, coopers; Woolston, who was employed in the top room; and Smith, who had been working

outside the building. It was known that there were two boys at play in Lime-street when the building fell. A day or two afterwards the body of one was found. It was that of John Brewer, six years of age, son of George Brewer, an oil-miller, in the employ of Messrs. Walker and Smith. The child was last seen alive about twenty minutes past eleven o'clock in the morning, near the Old Sugar House, with a youth named William Cato, who was subsequently got out of the ruins, escaping with but slight injury.

Mr. Smith, one of the owners, stated that there were not more than 10,000 quarters of linseed in the building at the time. Some minutes before the accident it was noticed that the pressure of the seed had occasioned the breakage of some windows, and joiners were sent for to batten them up. Happily, they had not got to work, or they too might have been numbered among the dead.

28. FEARFUL BOILER EXPLOSION IN SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE.—The forge boiler at the Moxley Iron and Steel Works near Bilston exploded while the works were in full operation. Five puddlers were killed on the spot and six others died subsequently from the injuries they received. This was one of the most disastrous accidents of the class that has occurred in South Staffordshire for many years past. It can only be compared with one which occurred at the Millfields Iron Works, not far from the same place, some years ago, which occasioned the death of fourteen work-people, and which resulted in the formation of the Boiler Inspection Association.

The names of the dead were Joseph Reynolds, unmarried; Jeremiah Curtis, married; Patrick Braughton, married, with four children;—Curtis, married, and nephew of Jeremiah Curtis; and Edward Jones, unmarried. These were the five who were taken out of the ruins dead. Reynolds and Curtis had their skulls cloven, and were otherwise crushed and burnt. The rest were also burnt, scalded, and crushed. Their blackened corpses could be very easily identified, because they had not been greatly disfigured by fire. The four who died in the hospital were William Neale, seventeen, from fracture of the base of the skull and scalds over chest, arms, and legs; the engineer of the forge, David Jenkins, forty, married, with three children, from depressed fracture of the skull and burns on chest; Thomas Reynolds, fourteen, from severe scalds over the whole of his body; and Charles Higgins, seventeen, also from severe scalds upon almost every part of his body.

The two deceased who neither died in the hospital, nor were found dead in the ruins, were Noah Millward, thirty-six, married, who lived in Oxford-street, Bilston, and Isaac Page, of Falling's-heath, Darlaston, thirty, married. Millward was found late in the night in the canal adjoining the works. At the time of the explosion he was working at his furnace near to the boiler, and was driven thence to nearly the opposite side of the canal, a

distance of, perhaps, thirty yards. Different from all the rest, who were either crushed, or scalded, or burnt to death, this man seemed from the appearance of the body to have been drowned. Happily, the boiler when it went off shot across the canal, and not into the works, or the loss of life must have been much greater. The forge mill had a spacious and substantial roof, supported at each end by cast-iron pillars, upon which rested iron girders. These pillars and girders were snapped into numerous pieces, all of which became engines of death and devastation, and half the great roof became at once a wreck.

29. THE CHURCH CONGRESS AT DUBLIN.—The Church Congress was this year held in Dublin, and occupied the remainder of the week. The proceedings, as usual, were opened by a grand service at St. Patrick's Cathedral, the sermon being preached by the Dean of Cork, Dr. Magee. The present crisis in the history of the Church naturally formed the basis of a considerable portion of the discourse. The Dean lamented that the national recognition of the Divine Being, and the proper provision for His worship, were not now considered as first duties of the State. He regretted that the axiom of modern statesmen was that nations had no God, and that the Church was nothing more than a corporation. He believed that this idea of a creedless and Godless State was fraught with great peril to the Church, and that all members of the Anglican communion should be called upon to repudiate it. Afterwards, the members assembled in the exhibition palace, and the most rev. president, the Archbishop of Dublin, delivered the inaugural address, in which he claimed the congress as an expression of the sympathy of the English for the Irish Branch of the Church at the present momentous crisis.

The sittings of the congress were wound up by discussions on the best means of increasing the efficiency of the Church Service, in which Earl Nelson and Mr. Beresford Hope took part. Other subjects debated were the influence of scientific investigations on the minds of those who conduct them, and the Church and the periodical literature of the day.

30. MEETING OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION AT BIRMINGHAM.—The twelfth annual congress of this association began at Birmingham, under the presidency of the Earl of Carnarvon.

At eight o'clock in the evening the general meeting of members and associates was held in the Town Hall, when the president of the year delivered an address. After some brief preliminary observations, he said that most of the questions proposed for discussion related to matters of internal economy and administration; for it had always been the object of the association, in its consideration of our municipal law, penal system, education, sanitary reform, and trade questions, to look to them in their home connexion; and when inquiries were extended to foreign countries it was with a domestic purpose.

After alluding to subjects of internal economy and adminis-

tration, and remarking on the enormous progress of sanitary science as witnessed in our own day, the noble president proceeded to observe that cleanliness and sanitary precautions, though powerful agents to morality, were not all-sufficient, and the question still arose, "What are the principal causes of crime?" Then came the further question, "Whether reformatory treatment should be extended to adults?" In a certain sense he answered yes, for penal discipline might and ought to be to a certain extent reformatory. But the reformation of the criminal must be considered along with his punishment and the security of society. Where the State was powerless, private associations—like the "*Société de Patronage*," in France, and the "*Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society*," in England—might do much. Beyond this the State could hardly safely go, because our reformatory system seemed to him chiefly applicable in its principles to the young, because the law must presuppose a certain malice and deliberation in men of mature years which it is willing, by a humane fiction, to ignore in children, and because with older men the confirmed habits of a lifetime rarely admit of modification, still more rarely of absolute change. He personally had long entertained and expressed his opinion that repeated re-convictions, even for minor offences, ought to be treated with far greater severity than is now the case; and that, for the sake of the offender, of society, and of the economical administration of the law, the withdrawal for any lengthened periods of the criminal from his companions and the opportunities of crime would be both the most effective and the most humane treatment.

The subject of penal discipline was next discussed, and it was pointed out that improvement on the system generally, and especially by adopting portions of the Irish system, had been made.

As regarded education, the subject of primary instruction had, since the great constitutional change of last year, assumed an importance far beyond that which it possessed in former years; and, for the interest and the very safety of society, the borders of the present system of education must be enlarged. There were classes which it did not touch, there were classes which it only touched and no more. The lowest part of the middle classes, in spite of some recent and most noble efforts, were often receiving an education as bad as it was—proportionately to their means—expensive, whilst a not inconsiderable portion of the agricultural class remained comparatively untaught, and, if untaught, then open to every delusion that falsehood could suggest or credulity accept. The day when ignorance, whether in town or country, was regarded as a means of safety to the rest of the community was past, and the alternative of docile stupidity—never justifiable—was, in our present circumstances, impossible. A knowledge of other classes in other parts of the country, of the difference of wages, of employments, of the new markets for labour here and

elsewhere, was dawning, and sometimes, it might be feared, through mists of prejudice and ignorance. He did not desire that the common school system of America should be taken as our model. Hitherto voluntarism, self-government, denominational, and consequently religious instruction, with a certain amount of State aid and inspection, had been the accepted principles of English primary education; and he hardly saw how we could altogether dispense with any one of those principles. With the question of compulsory education the equally grave subject of religious instruction was inseparably blended; and it would be ultimately found impossible to consider the one apart from the other. Besides primary education, Parliament would have to consider the subject of those middle-class educational endowments of which there had too often been a misapplication of revenue, and a misapplication of studies; while the great public schools must also come under revision. Then, too, in Birmingham, the centre of such great manufacturing and artisan life, the serious question of technical education could not be passed by. Beyond the technical education for the architect, the civil engineer, the merchant, and the chemical manufacturer, there was that which could be practically and advantageously given to artisans. Towards this schools of art and drawing instruction could much contribute; but the necessity of general technical education was incontrovertible, in order that this country should be able to hold her own in that wide industrial competition with the other nations of the civilized world in which we are engaged; and, as regards technical education generally, its basis must be laid in sound principles of elementary instruction, and the later teaching must depend upon the earlier.

Touching upon trades unions, the noble lord, while expressing his horror of the lawless and detestable crimes which have been committed under their sanction, gave all credit to those institutions for their advantages and merits, whether as regarded their benefit phase or their protection against undue pressure in particular circumstances. But while he recognized in these unions such protection as might secure reasonable conditions in what must be a bargain between workman and employer, he deprecated their being used for the enhancement of wages by means of strikes, and these points were most fully and elaborately argued out; and the principle of arbitration in cases of dispute was dwelt upon and its advantages illustrated; while an opinion was expressed that if the sister principle of co-operation was fairly and prudently applied, of which that at Rochdale was a type, it would tend materially towards a solution of the question between capital and labour.

The acquisition of the telegraphs by the State was dwelt upon approvingly, and in conclusion Lord Carnarvon reviewed the operations of the Social Science Association during the ten years of its existence; paid a high tribute to its founder and president,

the late Lord Brougham; and finally said that in the history of a great people there is room for ability of more than one kind, and, like the Roman Pantheon, it may contain every virtue and high quality that can ennoble and consecrate the life of the nation.

There were four departments, comprised under the following heads:—1, Jurisprudence and Amendment of the Law; 2, Education; 3, Health; 4, Economy and Trade. And these were again divided into sections.

On the 1st of October Lord Lyttelton read a paper on Education, and Mr. Vernon Harcourt read another on International Law.

On the 2nd, Mr. W. N. Massey delivered an able address on Jurisprudence, and in the evening a public meeting was held in the Town Hall, at which about 2000 working men were present. The chair was occupied by the Earl of Carnarvon. Mr. Vernon Harcourt, Q.C., addressed the assembly. He particularly referred to the immense armaments which were maintained in Europe, and which had the effect of paralyzing the nations. If the working men of this great country wished to signalize their rule, and leave traditions of which their children's children might be proud, they should make Parliament establish a policy of peace. Lord Lyttelton spoke of the growing importance of education, and then alluded to the fact that the electoral power in boroughs was getting more and more into the hands of the working classes. It was therefore of the greatest necessity that they should be educated, to enable them rightly to use the power committed to them. Lord Houghton referred to the question of public health. Professor Fawcett advocated compulsory education, with separate rating for educational purposes until endowments were made. He further spoke in favour of University Reform. Mr. Ernest Noel and the Rev. R. W. Dale also addressed the meeting.

The proceedings of the 3rd included an address by Mr. Hastings, the chairman of the council, on the life and labours of the late Lord Brougham, who for many years was president of the association. Lord Lyttelton presided in the education department, in which a paper by Miss Emily Davies was read, sketching a plan for establishing a college for the instruction of women. A resolution pledging the meeting to an expression of opinion in favour of the proposed college was submitted, but afterwards withdrawn. In the section devoted to economy and trade, the removal of fiscal impediments to commerce, and the pressure of taxation as affecting the development of trade, were amongst the subjects on which discussions arose. Dr. Farr was the chairman in the health department, where Mr. Robert Rawlinson read a paper on river obstructions and pollutions by manufactories.

On the 5th a long address was given by Dr. W. H. Rumsey, who took for his subjects of discourse air, water, and earth. Mr. Dixon, M.P., presided in the department devoted to education; Dr. Rumsey in that of health; and Mr. Fawcett, M.P., in that of

economy and trade. In the municipal law section there was a discussion on the representation of minorities.

In the evening a soirée was given in the Town Hall, in connexion with this association, which was a great success.

The proceedings of the 6th began with an address by Professor Fawcett, M.P. on the connexion between the principles of economic science and their application to trade. It was read by Mrs. Fawcett. In the department of economy and trade, over which Mr. Fawcett presided, Colonel Maude read a paper analyzing the objects and work of trades unions. The jurisprudence section was occupied by a discussion on the amendments required in the existing law of bankruptcy. The department which dealt with repression of crime was presided over by Sir Walter Crofton, who received a warm vote of thanks at the close of the discussion.

The concluding public meeting of the association was held, on the 7th, in the Town Hall.

— **EXPLOSION AT THE GREEN PIT, RUABON.**—One of the most terrific accidents that has ever happened in this locality occurred at the Green Pit, belonging to the New British Iron Company, near Ruabon, by which twelve men were killed and fifteen injured. The cause of this appalling accident was an explosion of gas, which occurred a little after eleven o'clock, and the effect of which was not only severely felt over all the workings, but also at a distance of two miles. It was also felt and heard at Ruabon, as also some distance on the Llangollen line of railway, and at other places at equal distance from the scene of the explosion. The floor in the vicinity of the mouth of the shaft was torn up, and fully testified to the great force of the explosion. The No. 1 shaft was blocked up for some time; Mr. Ralph Darlington, underground manager of the pits, and Mr. Robert Taylor, underlooker of the No. 2 pit, were the first who descended the No. 2 shaft after the explosion. Dr. Burton, with Mr. T. Lloyd Evans, arrived at the scene of the accident in twenty minutes after it occurred, and shortly afterwards Dr. Burton, with Mr. Evans, the manager of the New British Iron Company, and Mr. Popplewell, engineer, descended the pit for the purpose of ascertaining the number of dead and wounded, and to make arrangements for those who were only injured to be brought up first. There was, of course, great difficulty in finding all who were killed, owing to the rubbish beneath which some of them were buried. The excitement in the pit was so great after the accident that the men from all points rushed to the pit's mouth, and were the first to be drawn to the bank. The men were afterwards wound up, and immediately upon their arrival at the bank they were attended to by Dr. Burton and his assistant, and conveyed home in carts which were ordered for the purpose. As soon as the accident became known the scene of excitement throughout the neighbourhood was intense, and half-frantic women and children were to be seen running from all directions to the pit, where the excitement was increased by seeing some of

their relatives or friends brought up either dead or injured. Eight of the dead bodies and all the injured men and boys were wound up out of the No. 2 pit, and those who were killed were placed in the lamp room, and were soon identified. They were soon afterwards taken to their houses in conveyances. The remaining four dead bodies were drawn up the No. 1, pit and placed in carts in readiness. The scene of restoring the injured, some of whom seemed in a very lifeless state, was one of the most exciting character; and in a few instances it required a good deal of time to bring some of them round.

OCTOBER.

1. FATAL RAILWAY ACCIDENT NEAR RUGBY.—A fatal accident happened near Birdingbury station, on the Leamington and Coventry branch of the London and North-Western Railway, to the train which left Rugby at half-past twelve and was due at Leamington at 1 p.m. The train consisted of one engine and tender, five carriages, and two break-vans. About a mile and a half from Rugby, while running along a piece of straight line, known as Draycot bank, the whole of the carriages suddenly left the metals, and rolled down the embankment by the side of the line. One of the second-class carriages was shattered almost into fragments, and the others were more or less broken. The engine and tender remained on the line, and were despatched to Birdingbury, whence a telegram was sent to Leamington for assistance. In the meantime every thing was done by the passengers who had escaped being injured to render aid to their less fortunate fellow-travellers. Two gentlemen, named Davis, were found in a dying state, and both expired shortly after they were extricated from underneath the carriages. They were found to be father and son. A Mr. Elsworth, who had travelled from London, received very serious injuries, and lay for some time in a critical state at Leamington. Two German gentlemen were also hurt, one having a dislocated shoulder, and the other having sustained injuries to his foot. Several other passengers received bruises and cuts, and were severely shaken. As soon as assistance arrived a fresh train was made up, in which the passengers were conveyed to Leamington. Those who were unable to proceed to their own homes were sent to the Bath Hotel, where they were attended by a surgeon.

The following verdict of the jury gives the cause of the accident:—"The jury is of opinion that the deceased persons met with their deaths by the displacement of rails caused by the deficient state of the trenails. That the present mode of inspecting the

permanent way is too superficial to guard against similar accidents. The jury recommend that the attention of the directors should be called to the fact that trenails alone are not sufficient to insure the safety of the passengers, as has been proved by the recent accident, and that iron spikes should be used, as has been recommended by Captain Tyler."

3. ROYAL CHRISTENING AT KENSINGTON PALACE.—The infant son of Prince and Princess Teck was christened in the dining-room of Kensington Palace. The sponsors were the King of Wirtemberg, Alexander, Duke of Wirtemberg, Duke Philip of Wirtemberg, the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, the Prince of Wales, the Duke of Cambridge, Prince Louis of Hesse, the Queen, the Princess of Wales, the Duchess of Cambridge, and the Duchess of Inverness. The child was baptized in the names of Adolphus Charles Alexander Albert Edward George Philip Louis Ladislaus. After the ceremony the Prince and Princess Teck gave a *déjeuner* in the council-room to the company present at the rite, and Duke Philip of Wirtemberg, the Duke of Cambridge, the Grand Duchess and the Hereditary Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, the Duchess of Inverness, Count and Countess Gleichen, Lady Marian Alford, and Lady Georgiana Grey.

—METROPOLITAN WESTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY.—Another link in our widely-extended chain of metropolitan railways was opened for public traffic. The new line traverses an important district, and leaves only a very short space—a little over 600 yards—to effect a junction with the line running into Palace Yard, which will be completed before January 1. All that will then remain to complete the entire circle will be the river-side portion, along the Thames Embankment, up Cannon-street, and along Great Tower-street, to Aldgate. There are five stations upon the Extension opened this month—one at Paddington (facing the Great Western Hotel), one at Bayswater, one at Notting-hill-gate, one at Kensington, and the present terminus in Gloucester-road, Brompton. The situations of all these are admirable. Two deserve especial mention—the stations at Paddington and Kensington. Each of these is larger than the Waterloo terminus, and on other points of convenience there is literally no comparison. Externally, architectural beauty has not been lost sight of; so that, while the new stations contain within themselves all that the public can possibly require, they are ornaments to the neighbourhoods in which they have been erected. The contractors are Messrs. Kelk and Lucas.

7. DREADFUL EXPLOSION AT BARNSELY.—About 7 a.m. a dreadful explosion occurred at a manufactory of fireworks in Barnsley, belonging to Mr. George Norris, by which six persons were killed immediately, and five others died subsequently of their injuries. The manufactory was situated in Doncaster-road, on the outskirts of the town. It was twenty yards in length, and consisted of three small buildings, one being detached from the other two.

There were about twenty persons employed at the works, but they had not all arrived at the time of the accident.

About eight minutes to seven o'clock the inhabitants of the surrounding district were startled by the explosion, which shook the houses for a considerable distance, and was heard two miles off. It was then discovered that the detached building was on fire, and that the flames were spreading rapidly. The roof and walls had been blown completely away, and fragments of them scattered in all directions. A large number of people were quickly on the spot, and the first to arrive met several of the boys and girls leaving the place, screaming dreadfully. Their clothes were on fire, and all of them had been more or less burnt. Mr. Norris, who had only arrived a few minutes before the explosion, was got out alive, but dreadfully injured. A man, named Robinson, boldly rushed into the place and caught hold of a girl named Hawkey, whose clothes were burning. He tore them off with great difficulty and had her at once taken home on a stretcher, but she died very shortly afterwards. More assistance having arrived, several of the boys and girls were got out. The foreman, named Bywater, was found fully 100 yards from the place of the explosion, lying on the ground, every portion of his clothing being on fire. He had been thrown that distance out of the building. His clothes were cut off, and he was removed to an adjoining house, where he was found to have sustained dreadful injuries. One boy was in a corner of the building alone, but no one could get near him for the flames. A bystander named Butler got a long stick, and, climbing upon the wall above, at great risk to himself, held it towards the boy; the latter got hold of it, and was in the act of being raised, when his hands being scorched, he lost his hold and fell into the flames.

Nearly an hour after the occurrence the engine belonging to the town made its appearance and played on the fire, but it was not extinguished until the whole of the building was burnt to the ground. A search was then made, and among the first of the bodies discovered was that of the forewoman of the girls, Mrs. Mary Ann Cooper. Her remains were found in a sort of fireplace, dreadfully burnt. The bodies of another girl and of two boys were found close to the spot where the building stood, all dreadfully blackened and disfigured. The whole of the children who had been working in the place (with one exception) were got out. Three of them were removed to the workhouse, where every attention was paid to them. The others were taken to their own places of residence. Every assistance was rendered by the medical men in the town, who were promptly on the spot.

8. VISIT OF THE PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF WALES TO GLASGOW.—The Prince and Princess of Wales visited Glasgow, and his Royal Highness performed the ceremony of laying the foundation-stone of the new buildings of the Glasgow University. These buildings were commenced in consequence of the purchase

of the old site by the City of Glasgow Union Railway Company, who required the land for the purposes of a central railway station.

Their Royal Highnesses arrived, by the North British Railway, soon after twelve o'clock, and were accompanied by Prince John of Denmark, Lieutenant-General Knollys, and the Hon Mrs. Coke. They were received on alighting at the platform by the Lord Provost and Mrs. Lumsden, Lady Belhaven, Lady Emily Hamilton, the Lord Justice-General (who is Rector of the University), the Lord Advocate, Lord Rosehill, Principal Barclay (of the Glasgow University), the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod, Major-General Rumley, Colonel the Hon. F. Colborne, and others. The Prince wore a general's uniform, and the ribbon of the Order of St. Andrew. The Princess wore a lavender silk dress and a pink and white bonnet. The Lord Provost wore a court suit, and the Principal and Rector of the University their robes of office. After a formal introduction, the royal pair were conducted to their carriage, and, amid the cheers of many thousands of spectators, took their place in a procession which drove to the City Hall. The route was along the west and southern sides of George-square, down Frederick-street, through Ingram-street, along North Albion-street, and into College-street, where are the old University buildings, thence down High-street, through Stirling-street, and South Albion-street to the City Hall. The streets were densely thronged with spectators, and the decorations of the houses and public buildings were profuse. On reaching the City Hall their Royal Highnesses were conducted to the seats reserved for them upon the platform. Their appearance in the hall, which had already been filled with spectators, was the signal for loud and prolonged cheering. The National Anthem was performed on the great organ, and the Lord Provost then delivered a brief address. The Town Clerk read a certificate testifying that the freedom of the city had been conferred on his Royal Highness. This document, placed in a gold casket, was handed by the Lord Provost to the Prince. An address from the Corporation was then read by the Town Clerk, and a copy of it was handed to the Prince in another casket. His Royal Highness made a short address in reply, thanking the Lord Provost and all the Glasgow gentlemen for their hearty welcome offered to himself and the Princess, expressing his peculiar satisfaction in having become a freeman of such an ancient, loyal, and famous city; and saying that the Princess herself was truly sensible of their kindness, for nothing could be more valuable to her than to possess the hearts and affections of the people of this country, which she had adopted as her own.

The whole party then left the City Hall, and went in procession, as before, to Gilmore-hill. Their Royal Highnesses were greeted here with enthusiastic acclamations by a great crowd of people. They were conducted to the reception-rooms, where the authorities

of the University conferred both on the Prince of Wales and on Prince John of Denmark the honorary degree of LL.D. They were next escorted to the platform erected on the site where the stone was to be laid. An address from the Principal and professors of the University was read by Principal Barclay, to which his Royal Highness replied:—"My Lord Rector and Professors,—I thank you for your expressions of devoted loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen, and of dutiful attachment to the royal family. It affords me the greatest satisfaction to become a member and graduate of your University, and at the same time, to visit a city the close connexion of which with you had been so beneficial to both, as well as to the interests of learning and knowledge. The presence of so many of all classes of the citizens of Glasgow around me, and their liberal subscriptions for the prosecution of the work we are engaged in this day, attest the value they attach to its completion, and their sense of the advantages they and the people of Scotland derive from your institution. The interest which my lamented father took in the advancement of every branch of science and education would stimulate me to follow his example and promote by every means in my power the success of your University, and the objects for which it has been founded. We may confidently expect that the eminent men educated here in time past are only the precursors of a long train equally to be distinguished by every scientific requirement. The Princess of Wales rejoices in the opportunity afforded her of taking part in this day's ceremony, and cordially thanks you for your kind wishes."

His Royal Highness then performed the ceremony of laying the foundation-stone, and the Princess also graciously accepted the invitation to lay a companion stone as a memorial of her visit. So the proceedings terminated, and the royal party shortly afterwards returned to Glasgow, where they took luncheon with the Lord Provost, and at six in the evening they left by train for Edinburgh.

9. **BRUTAL MURDER IN WALES.**—At a late hour of the evening a brutal murder was committed at a retired spot named Porthrydyfen, situate about four miles from Neath, on the road to Maesteg, Glamorganshire. The man who committed the crime, and who subsequently gave himself up to the custody of the county constabulary, was a road labourer, about fifty years of age, named Robert Webster, and the victim of his cruelty was a woman named Mary Morris, about forty-five years of age, and with whom it was stated that he had cohabited for some time past. The principal evidence against the accused were the statements he made when he gave himself into custody, and which were sworn to at the inquest held on the 11th, before Mr. H. Cuthbertson, coroner. It appeared that the plaintiff and the deceased had been drinking together in the evening at a public-house called the "Collier's Arms," Evilfach, but they left the house perfectly sober. After the landlord and

landlady had retired to bed, and had slept some little time, they were aroused by loud and violent knocks at the door, and upon the landlord going down the prisoner was there, and said, "I have killed poor, dear Polly," adding that she was then lying in the road. The landlord at once ran to the spot indicated, and found the deceased covered with blood, with frightful cuts and gashes in her head and neck, lying in the road quite dead. The prisoner then said he should go and give himself up to the police, which he did, and on the way to the police-station at Neath he told the county officer that on the way home from the public-house on Saturday night he and the deceased had a row. That she called him a —— old ——, and struck him a blow in the face, whereupon he said, "You shan't strike me again," and immediately struck her down with the hook. Mr. Ryding, a surgeon of Neath, described the injuries. There were several cuts and wounds in the face and neck, one particularly in the centre of the neck, which had evidently been done with some sharp cutting instrument, as though sawing it. He was of opinion, however, that death had resulted from strangulation, and there were marks in the neck of heavy pressure as if by the fingers. The jury immediately returned a verdict of wilful murder against Robert Webster, who was thereupon committed for trial at the next assizes for the county of Glamorgan.

21. ARRIVAL OF THE CROWN PRINCESS OF PRUSSIA.—The Crown Princess of Prussia (Princess Royal of England), travelling incognito under the title of Countess Lingen, arrived in Dover, and, after a short stay at the Lord Warden Hotel, left by special train for St. Leonards-on-Sea. Her Royal Highness was accompanied by her two youngest children, Princess Victoria and Prince Waldemar. She was received with warm greetings.

22. ARRIVAL OF THE QUEEN OF HOLLAND.—The Queen of Holland, attended by her suite, arrived in England from the Continent. Her Majesty crossed from Calais in a special steamer, and landed at the Admiralty Pier, Dover. The Queen was received by the several naval officials and the military authorities of the garrison. Her Majesty travelled from Dover by the ordinary train upon the South-Eastern Railway to London, en route for Torquay, whither the Queen proceeded for the benefit of her health.

23. DISASTROUS GALE—GALLANT RESCUE BY A LIFE-BOAT.—A destructive gale raged on this and the following day—causing considerable damage to shipping. The most distressing wreck of all was that of the Government lighter "Devon," which was wrecked on the Brissons Rocks, off the Land's End, about two o'clock, a.m., when sixteen out of seventeen persons, including one woman and two children, perished; but the rescue of this survivor was perhaps the noblest service ever performed by a life-boat. With the dawn of the day the wreckage was observed all round the coast, and on the rocks a poor fellow was observed. Immediately a messenger

was sent for the Sennen life-boat, "The Cousins, William and Mary Anne," of Bideford, belonging to the National Life-Boat Institution. The boat was promptly manned by Matthew Nicholas, the gallant coxswain; S. Morrison, of the Coastguard, and twelve other brave men. They pulled away in the face of a tremendous surf rolling in from the Atlantic. At last they succeeded in approaching the rocks, but it was nearly an hour before the poor fellow could be roused to avail himself of the offered means for his rescue. That rescue, however, required the utmost skill on the part of the man who was to fire the rocket apparatus from the boat; for in the event of any thing going wrong with the apparatus the lives of some of the life-boat's crew themselves would probably have been sacrificed. The rocket was fired with great precision, and thus a line was conveyed to the poor sailor, who was afterwards safely got into the life-boat.

30. POLITICAL RIOTS AT BLACKBURN.—At a late hour in the evening serious riots broke out at Blackburn. The municipal elections were to be decided on the question of politics, and as the Parliamentary election was at hand, each ward was vigorously contested. Several municipal meetings were held in public-houses. Two of them were convened by the opposing-candidates in the district of Nova Scotia, where the riots commenced. At each of the meetings it was the custom of the candidates to treat all who attended, and when they were dissolved the streets were filled with drunken men and youths. Many of them were armed with large sticks and bludgeons, and when the two parties unfortunately met high words passed between them; almost immediately they came to blows, and before many minutes were over there was a general riot participated in by several hundred persons. There were no lamps at the place where the fighting occurred, but it being moonlight the scene could be witnessed from a distance. Mr. Chief-Constable Potts and a large number of policemen charged the mob, but it was some time before they could break up the mob by the free use of their truncheons. A cry of "To the Ivy Inn" was raised, and the crowd immediately rushed headlong to Infirmary-street, where the Ivy Inn—the committee-room of the Liberal candidates—was situated. They gathered round the front of the house, and in a few seconds all the panes of glass in the windows were demolished. The police came up and succeeded in collaring five of the rioters. The mob, again repulsed by the police, moved further on. It appeared that a Liberal meeting was being held at the Ivy Inn, when an alarm was brought that the Tory, or Murphythe, party had broken the windows of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church. The Liberals then left the inn, and chased the Tory faction over the Leeds and Liverpool canal bridge. They learnt that the windows of the Castle Hotel had been broken, and this made them eager to try their strength with their opponents. They were unable to overtake the Tories; but, not to be balked of their revenge, they assembled in front of the Infirmary Hotel, kept

by Mr. Ralph Holden, well known as the Tory rendezvous. They broke the windows, and, as there were several of the opposite party present, a fight ensued, in the midst of which the landlord was attacked with a bludgeon. The person who committed this assault was apprehended and taken into custody. The Mayor of the borough, the Chief Constable, and the Town Clerk proceeded on the 31st to Fulwood barracks, near Preston, and asked that the troops might be held in readiness in the event of further outbreaks. In consequence of the arrangements made, forty of the 1st Dragoon Guards arrived in town, and during the day protected several of the polling-booths. Extra constables to the number of 100 were obtained from neighbouring towns, and distributed throughout the streets. At an early hour the polling-booths were taken possession of by crowds of rough men, and about eleven o'clock serious riots commenced. About that time several persons were wounded near a polling-booth in Church-street. A crowd, carrying bludgeons, bars of iron, &c., came running down a narrow street close by, and when they met they had a fight. The mob used their weapons with the greatest brutality, and as the military were at another part of the town, the affray lasted for some time. Men were carried away covered with blood, but still the fighting was continued with as much brutality as ever. Some time afterwards the Mayor and Town Clerk arrived, and at this juncture there were nearly a thousand persons engaged in the fight. The Town Clerk read the Riot Act, and in a few seconds the Dragoons came up and soon succeeded in restoring quietness. About the same time there was serious rioting going on at Trinity Ward. Fighting commenced there at half past nine in the morning, between two parties who were fighting for the possession of the polling-booth. A cart of stones was kept in readiness by the blue and orange party, and a crowd of women kept supplying them with missiles. Most of the rioters were armed with picking sticks about two feet in length and an inch and a half thick at the head. They appeared to have been newly made. The number of persons wounded was very considerable. The surgeries in the neighbourhood were literally crowded with persons waiting their turn till the surgeon could dress their wounds. All along the pavement streams of blood were flowing, and the sickening sight of men with blood flowing from their heads and faces met one at every turn. The police charged the mob with drawn cutlasses and truncheons, committing great havoc; but they did not succeed in restoring even comparative quiet for a long time, and many of them came off with serious injuries. Business was interrupted at the polls for hours together.

— FEARFUL BOILER EXPLOSION.—In the afternoon, between two and three o'clock, a boiler explosion occurred in Barron's-place, Waterloo-road, by which twelve persons were dreadfully injured. The house in which the accident happened was a brick and timber building, the ground floor of which was in the occupation of Mr. Norris, a steam saw miller. The upper floor was

rented by Mr. James Powell, a glass-cutter, and Charles Read, a stand turner, &c. In the basement was a boiler and engine, and up to the time of the disaster all was considered safe. The works were in full progress during the afternoon, when about half-past two o'clock the whole neighbourhood was shaken by a tremendous report. Within the immediate locality of Barron's-place the air was filled with smoke, steam, and dust. Shortly afterwards the cry of "Fire" was raised, and the engines from Waterloo-road arrived, accompanied by a body of firemen, together with a number of police-constables from the Tower-street station. A crowd gathered round the smoking and blackened ruins of what a few moments before was the saw mills, and endeavours were at once made to rescue those who were known to be within the place. From a person who was engaged on the premises and escaped with but slight injuries an account was obtained of what had happened. From this it appeared that in the upper floor were James Powell, Robert Powell, Arthur Barnard, an apprentice, Charles Powell (son of James, aged eleven), Charles Read, and others; in the basement, George Green, twenty-one, a sawyer; William Bushby, eighteen, stoker; James Bancroft, labourer; James Norris, and Edward Norris, proprietor of the mill. The apprentice Barnard stated that he was engaged at work, when suddenly he was alarmed by a tremendous report, and then he felt the floor rise, and was thrown several feet in the air. He for a time lost all recollection, but on recovering found himself wedged in between a piece of timber and some rubbish, and around him a heap of smoking ruins. While in this position he saw, a few feet from him, the child Charles Powell among the ruins, his head just above the rubbish, screaming for help. Barnard managed to extricate himself, and getting hold of the child, made his way towards an opening in the wall, and both were got out by the firemen and others at hand. Mr. Charles Powell was next found between some timber and rubbish, part of his body being through a skylight. Mr. Robert Powell was discovered lying near the exploded boiler, and upon him had fallen some of the scalding water from it. The other men were afterwards extricated, and, as soon as possible, all were conveyed to St. Thomas's and Guy's Hospitals. Other persons were injured, but less severely. The stoker, William Bushby, was able to make a statement. Shortly before the explosion he had shovelled on some fuel into the furnace, but had scarcely turned away before he was thrown down with great violence, and on coming to his senses found himself half buried in the ruins. All who were taken to the hospitals were dreadfully scalded, and most of them seriously bruised.

— FIRE AT THE STOKE-ON-TRENT RAILWAY STATION.—A very disastrous fire occurred in the night at the Stoke-on-Trent Railway Station—the head-quarters of the North Staffordshire Railway Company. It broke out about nine o'clock in a large building adjoining the station and used as repairing shops and a store-room,

and spread with such fearful rapidity that in less than two hours every thing in the sheds that was consumable was consumed, and of the building itself nothing but the bare walls was left. The head post-office of the district stood close to the sheds, and at one time there was every reason to fear that building would also be sacrificed, but the firemen directed their efforts to its preservation, and it escaped with a smoke-discoloured surface. No efforts of the firemen could arrest the progress of the fire in the sheds, where it raged until it had spent itself. At the time of its starting there were in the sheds three nearly new railway carriages, a horse-box, a large quantity of timber, sixty tarpaulin sheets, a number of first-class carriage-rugs and cushions, small quantities of oil, paint, and varnish, a stock of workmen's tools, and other materials. The building in which the fire broke out was between forty and fifty yards in length, about fifteen yards in width, and was divided into compartments, the partitions being made by large iron pillars. It was almost impossible to say in which of the compartments named the fire originated, for it had the appearance of being simultaneous. However, a porter averred that he first saw smoke coming from the middle compartment, and as it was in this that the dangerous combustibles—oil, varnish, turpentine, and tarpaulin covers—were stored, the amazingly rapid spread of the fire was explained. The North Staffordshire Railway Company's fire-engine arrived in twenty minutes after the fire was discovered, and the men set to work, not so much with the intention of saving the burning building as with the intention of preventing, if possible, the fire from approaching to the passenger station and to the post-office. The letter-bags and despatches were first put in a place of security, then the valuable articles contained in the office were removed, and then the attention of the assistants was given to insuring the safety of the valuable papers, &c., contained in an office belonging to the railway company, and close to the post-office. The whole were removed in safety, the furniture (all that was movable) being also dragged out and strewn in the passages and on the platform, blocking up the way. The fire had, at a quarter-past ten, arrived at its greatest fury. The whole building from end to end was one mass of flame. For about two minutes the roof stood firm after the fire arrived at its climax, then with a sudden crash it gave way, and tumbled into the burning mass beneath, raising such a cloud of sparks, smoke, and burning embers that the people about rushed back and precipitated themselves upon the people in the rear, among whom a great panic arose, in consequence of an alarm which was raised that the walls were falling. The skeletons of the carriages were discernible in the great blaze, the iron rods appearing like red stripes in the furnace glow. The excitement seemed now to abate, and the people began to disperse. The damage done amounted to nearly 4000*l*. There was no insurance on the building or contents.

— FRIGHTFUL ACCIDENT AT LIVERPOOL.—A dreadful accident

occurred in Rigby-street, Liverpool. On the left-hand side of the street stood a large block of warehouses, one portion of which was occupied as an oil-crushing mill, the other portion being occupied as a warehouse for the storage of seeds—linseed in bulk and cake. The warehouse in question was seven stories high, and on each floor there was a large quantity of loose seed and cake stowed. About two o'clock some men who had been on the fifth floor, observed that the centre heap of linseed in bulk was subsiding, but they believed that it was caused by the sliding away of the outer edge of the bulk. The machinery was working in the press-room, and every thing was going on as usual, when, about a quarter to three o'clock, a fearful crash was heard. The fifth story had given way, the joists having apparently broken in the centre, and fifty or sixty tons of linseed falling on the fourth floor—on which there was a similar quantity of produce stored—broke that down, and the whole, descending to the third and second stories, fell into the machine-room, where a number of pressmen, grinders, and others were employed. Not one of those engaged in the machine-room escaped, while several of the workmen employed near to the scene of the disaster sustained severe injuries about the head and arms. All the centre timbers of the several floors parted, leaving the flooring joists projecting from the opposite sides of the warehouse. Messrs. Wallace & Co., who occupied the range of warehouses, used every exertion to rescue those buried in the rubbish. After removing an immense quantity of linseed and oil-cake, they found the bodies of four men among some broken rafters. None of the bodies were disfigured, and it appeared that the unfortunate men had been suffocated by the grain.

—EARTHQUAKE IN ENGLAND.—Between half-past 10 and 11 p.m. an earthquake was felt in several parts of the midland and western counties. At Leamington three distinct shocks were felt, but at Birmingham the motion was very slight. The shock was also felt in various parts of Worcestershire, especially on the western bank of the Severn. At Worcester, persons in upper chambers did not experience the shock so acutely as those in the basement. Most of the reports agreed that the indications were accompanied by a noise as of a vehicle or train passing, or as of a “rushing mighty wind.” Similar accounts came from Chippenham, Bridgewater, Bristol and its neighbourhood, and Poyntington, Somerset. The movement extended as far west as Exeter, and was distinctly felt at Swansea and various parts of Glamorganshire and Monmouthshire, as Aberdare, Tredegar, Rhymney, &c. The nearest approach to London was Blackheath, where beds were shaken. Faringdon, Abingdon, Oxford, and Wallingford felt the shock, also Leicester.

The district affected was almost the same as that in which the severe shock was felt in October, 1863, and on this occasion, as then, the county of Worcester was the centre of the greatest disturbance. Meteorological observers noted (which may or may

not have been a mere coincidence) that the weather was as nearly as possible the same as it was five years ago, that a warm gusty wind had been blowing for some days, and that for several nights lightning had been almost constant. The temperature in the district where the shock was felt rose on the 31st no less than fifteen degrees.

NOVEMBER.

5. FATAL ACCIDENT ON THE SOUTH WALES RAILWAY.—One of the most disastrous accidents that have happened on the South Wales Railway since it has been amalgamated with the Great Western took place, and was unhappily attended with the grievous loss of three lives and the fearful maiming of six other persons. The accident occurred at a portion of the line between Newnham and Gatcombe stations in Gloucestershire, and about fourteen miles from Gloucester. The line in this vicinity runs a good deal close upon the western shore of the Bristol Channel, and is remarkably picturesque when the tide is in. The accident arose from a collision between the up London mail from South Wales and a cattle train which was preceding it, and was the most serious that has occurred on the whole of the line from Gloucester to Milford Haven since the memorable collision of two passenger trains which met on the same line of rails through a mistake in telegraphing at Port Talbot, Glamorganshire, many years ago. The catastrophe arose, it would appear, from the practice, often condemned, of running slow goods and cattle trains in front of fast passenger trains, without a sufficiently safe interval being allowed between them. In this case it led to the loss of life already mentioned, and incalculable domestic misery among the survivors and their relatives, to say nothing of the injury to property that has ensued. The following are the particulars of the accident:—

In the evening the up mail train from the terminus of the South Wales line at New Milford left Milford at its regular time, 5 p.m., on its up journey, *via* Gloucester and Swindon, and it kept good time for the whole of its journey up to the time of the catastrophe. The train left Carmarthen Junction at 6.15 p.m., and had been preceded five hours before by a special cattle train, which left Carmarthen at 1.30 p.m. There was nothing amiss up to 10.30 p.m., at which time the accident happened. The mail train, which consisted of a powerful engine and three passenger carriages, left Lydney station at about ten minutes past ten, and had passed the next small station as usual without stopping. It had arrived within about a mile of Bullo Pill, a small coal siding and goods

station, but not a passenger station, when the train ran suddenly into the special cattle train with an awful smash. It was a light night, but there was a fog along the side of the Bristol Channel, and this with a sharp curve in the line at the spot prevented the driver of the mail train seeing the tail red lights of the cattle train until the mail was close upon it. There was not time to jump, and the driver and his stoker, having first shut off steam, lay down on the floor of their engine, and the collision followed in a moment. The result may be anticipated. The last vehicle in the cattle train was a third-class carriage in which were riding the guard (William Probert) and the drovers in charge of the cattle—eight in number—viz., Evan Morgan, David Thomas, Edward James, Daniel Thomas, Benjamin Roberts, John George, William Edwards, and Philip Jones. The mail train was proceeding at full speed, and dashed with awful force into the hinder part of the cattle train, crushing the third-class carriages to pieces and scattering the fragments and the ill-fated occupants over the line. Three of the cattle trucks were also broken and twelve of the beasts were killed, several others being maimed. The powerful engine of the mail train having crushed up the third-class carriage of the cattle train mounted on the top of one of the trucks, where it remained fixed. The passengers in the mail train miraculously escaped almost unhurt. Nine of the passenger carriages left the rails, and, although some of the passengers in the first carriage were much shaken and knocked about, and all were greatly alarmed, none are reported as having been injured seriously.

When the first shock had passed, the passengers in the mail train hurried out of the carriages to see the fearful wreck. The guard and driver of the mail train, being unhurt, first despatched messengers up and down the line to stop any thing that might be coming along it. They found, as already described, the unfortunate drovers and the guard of the cattle train lying about the line among the wreck of the carriages and trucks. Three of them were dead, the guard and two of the drovers; and all the other drovers were grievously injured. The line was blocked with the broken carriages and with the dead and maimed, and the scene presented was fearful in the extreme. The nearest telegraph station to the scene of the accident was Bullo Pill, and a telegraphic message was sent as early as practicable from that station to Gloucester for assistance, and when the special train sent down from Gloucester had arrived the injured persons and the passengers of the mail were forwarded to Gloucester by it. The dead bodies were left at Bullo Pill. The special train from Gloucester returned to that city between two and three the next morning, in the care of a surgeon. The sufferers were at once conveyed to the Gloucester Infirmary, where Mr. Carter, the house surgeon, having been already apprised of the accident, was in readiness to receive them and administer promptly to their necessities.

The following persons were killed by this deplorable accident:—

William Probert, of Carmarthen, guard of the cattle train; David Thomas, of Llandilo, Carmarthenshire, cattle drover; Evan Morgan, of Carmarthen, also a cattle drover.

Six others were seriously injured.

7. EXTRAORDINARY CHARGE OF FORGERY.—On the preceding evening three of the City of London detective police, specially employed for the purpose, made a discovery of forged bills of exchange, of bills in process of fabrication, and of implements used in the forgery, at a place in Nicholas-lane, Lombard-street, and arrested three men, foreigners, on the spot. The prisoners were taken before the Lord Mayor to answer the charge, and the examination excited unusual interest from the attendant circumstances. They gave as their names Seigmund Strierner, forty-five years of age, residing in Queen's-road, Dalston; ; Gustav Stoven, twenty-nine, living in Nelson-square, Park-road, Peckham; and George Kunake, or Konike, about forty-five, residing in Henrietta-terrace, Blake-road, Peckham. The prisoners were all well dressed. They were nominally charged with forging and uttering two bills of exchange for 180*l.* 10*s.* and 120*l.* 7*s.* respectively, and eighteen other bills of exchange of various amounts, with intent to defraud; but that, as will be seen, hardly affords an adequate notion of the crime of which they are accused. The prisoners were undefended.

The City Solicitor (Mr. Nelson), addressing the Lord Mayor, said he appeared there to prosecute the three prisoners for one of the gravest offences that could be possibly committed in a commercial community. The prisoners, it would be found, had been engaged in the manufacture of fictitious paper to an enormous amount. In the autumn of last year a man named Gerson Wetzler was accused at that court of uttering a forged bill of exchange, of a foreign character, and having been committed for trial, was afterwards convicted at the Central Criminal Court. From information that came to the City Solicitor's knowledge in conducting the prosecution on that occasion, he was convinced the prisoner, with others, had been engaged for some time in systematic acts of forgery, and feeling that the trading interest, not only in the City of London, but in many parts of the country might be largely involved in the consequences of such a system, attention was called to the matter, and inquiries set on foot by the police of the City, the result of which had gone to show that forged bills of exchange must be in circulation to the amount of many thousands of pounds. He would not have made that statement if he did not believe it was warranted by facts within his knowledge. He held in his hand no less than twenty bills of exchange which had been fabricated within the last month—one for 620*l.* 14*s.*, another for 514*l.* 12*s.*, others for 320*l.* 10*s.*, 396*l.* 10*s.*, 480*l.*, 320*l.*, 440*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.*, 444*l.* 6*s.*, and 289*l.* 7*s.*, the rest being of less but still of considerable amounts in some cases; and the whole twenty amounted altogether to 5192*l.* 16*s.* 8*d.* They bore no less than seventy-four signatures,

all of which were forgeries, and they were drawn in no fewer than five different languages—ten in English, three in French, four in Italian, two in Spanish, and one in German. They purported to have been drawn in various parts of the civilized world,—three in the Mauritius, two in Constantinople, two at Elberfeld, and one each at Rio de Janeiro, Palermo, Odessa, Almeida, Havannah, Stettin Milano, Marseilles, Sydney, Philadelphia, Melbourne, New York, and Montreal. The Bench would see that they extended over a great part of the globe. Those forged bills of exchange in every instance but one were drawn on paper engraved and printed for the express purpose, and had the name of the drawer engraved in the usual way in the margin. In every case also they bore the names of some English firm as the acceptors, stamped by a die, so that any gentleman taking any one of such bills to his banker's, it would be assumed on the face of it to be a genuine bill of exchange. There were no less than twenty-two names of firms stamped on them, namely, four at Liverpool, one at Halifax, two in Glasgow, one at Huddersfield, two at Wolverhampton, two in Cork, two at Bradford, two in Manchester, one in Sunderland, two in Leith, four in Edinburgh, two at Wakefield, three at Sheffield, one at Leeds, one at Salford, one at Paisley, and one at Birmingham. When he said that the whole of those bills had been fabricated with the greatest ease and at a small outlay of money, the Lord Mayor would have no hesitation in arriving at the conclusion that those forgeries had been systematically perpetrated. The three prisoners were arrested on the 6th, manufacturing bills of exchange in a room in Nicholas-lane, within a stone's throw of the justice-room of the Mansion House, and in the heart of the City of London. Striemer, one of the prisoners, occupied a front room on the second floor, and was described as a translator of languages. Some of the bills that would be produced in evidence were only in their inchoate state. They were in course of fabrication, but not perfect, and in the room where the prisoners were the officers found as many as fifty-four dies, with the names upon them of various firms. They also found—and he was speaking without the least exaggeration—several hundreds of blank forms, and two books containing engraved forms of bills purporting in one book to be those of the Philadelphia Union Bank, and the Bench would see from the counter-foils how large must have been the circulation of such bills. The other book contained forms of bills of the Mercantile Bank of Sydney. From the surrounding circumstances there was reason to believe the prisoners had been doing a large business.

Detective Sergeant Webb said, "On the afternoon of the 6th, about three o'clock, I went, in company with Sergeant Moss and Whitney and Obee, to 20, Nicholas-lane, King William-street. We went upstairs, and in a front room on the second floor we found the three prisoners and another man. We told them we were officers, and that we should take them into custody for being concerned in forging and uttering a number of bills of exchange.

The prisoner Striemer said, 'What do you mean? I do not understand you. This is my office. I know nothing about any forged bills, and you have no right to take us.'

"The other prisoners were standing by his side when he said that. We told them to consider themselves in custody, and that we should search the office. It was a small room containing a desk and table. On the desk I found the bill produced, with the ink upon it still wet, on a writing pad. It purports to be dated 'New York, October 1, 1868,' and is for 45*l*. On the side of the same desk we found five other bills."

The City solicitor.—"They are all apparently drawn by banks abroad."

Webb.—"They purport to be made in blank by banks at Sydney, the Mauritius, Philadelphia, and Montreal. We also found a large quantity of forms of bills of exchange, several hundreds of them. We have not yet had time to count them. We also discovered fifty-four dies, with the names of as many different firms upon them, for accepting bills—some in Manchester, Liverpool, and many other large towns in the kingdom. We likewise found dies of the City and Union Banks. The name 'S. Striemer, translator of languages,' was painted on a glass panel of the door, and below it 'Gordon and Co., bill brokers.'"

The Lord Mayor remanded the prisoners for a few days, and they were removed to Newgate.

9. LORD MAYOR'S DAY.—The Lord Mayor's Show was marked by a revival of much of the old ceremonial splendour, and the streets on the route from Guildhall to Westminster were crowded by sight-seers. There was only one man in armour, but there was a profusion of bands. The old state coach, blazing in gold, was once more brought out, and the popularity of the show, as "an emblem of the people's sovereignty," was shown by the reception which was awarded to the new Lord Mayor along the line of route.

On leaving Guildhall the procession passed into Cheapside, thence along the Poultry, past the front of the Mansion House, round by King William-street into Cannon-street, then onward by way of Fleet-street and the Strand to Westminster. On arriving at Westminster Hall, which they did shortly after three o'clock, the civic authorities were conducted to the Court of Exchequer, and were received by the Lord Chief Baron and Barons Channell, Pigott, and Cleasby. Having taken the places assigned to them on the benches usually occupied by Queen's Counsel, the Common Serjeant, in the absence of the Recorder, addressed the Court, and introduced the new Lord Mayor, Mr. James Lawrence, whose personal career and services as a member of the Corporation were briefly described. The chief events of the mayoralty of the last Lord Mayor were also mentioned. The Lord Chief Baron replied in appropriate terms, and addressed the new Lord Mayor upon the duties and privileges of his office. The new Lord Mayor then took the prescribed oath; and, the other formalities having been

gone through, invited the learned Barons to the banquet at the Guildhall. He afterwards proceeded to the other Courts, where the Common Serjeant introduced his lordship, who in due form bade her Majesty's Judges to the banquet. The Lady Mayoress, in her state carriage, joined the procession at Westminster on its return to Guildhall.

Among the guests at Guildhall in the evening were the Duke of Cambridge, the Lord Chancellor, Mr. Disraeli, Lord Stanley, the Duke of Buckingham, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Home Secretary, one or two minor members of the Government, most of the Judges, the American Minister, and a host of civic dignitaries.

A most important statement, to the effect that all causes of disquietude between Great Britain and the United States had entirely ceased, was made by the Hon. Reverdy Johnson—the delight which the announcement was calculated to produce being only sobered down by the gradual process by which the public had been prepared for it. The Lord Mayor, in proposing the toast of "The Foreign Ministers," coupled with it the name of the United States' Minister.

The toast having been duly honoured, Mr. Johnson repeated the statement he had made elsewhere, that all differences between England and America had been settled, and that without touching in the slightest degree the rights or the honour of either nation. And if in the future, he said, diplomatic negotiations were conducted in the spirit with which Lord Stanley and himself had carried on their negotiations, wars in the future would be next to impossible. "From 1846 to the present time," his Excellency proceeded, "from one cause or another, there were in all that intermediate time clouds which alarmed the people of both countries. We have managed, as you will soon discover, to remove those clouds, and to leave nothing upon either nation but the undimmed sunshine of peace. And, without meaning to disparage the achievements of armies or of navies—achievements which we, in common with yourselves, have honoured, whether they be those in which your own arms or ours were concerned—I make bold to say, that if diplomacy in the future be so conducted that war cannot occur, the rank of diplomacy will be as high, perhaps higher, than it has ever been.

The toast of "The Health of her Majesty's Ministers" was responded to by Mr. Disraeli, who took occasion, from the remarks of the American Minister, to recall the fact that last year, when every body was full of apprehension about our relations with America, he had ventured to say the differences would be satisfactorily settled. He had said the same about the peace of Europe, and the accuracy of that statement had not been impeached by any thing that had occurred. "I admit," said the right hon. gentleman, "that at present in the state of Europe there are on the surface causes for disquietude and apprehension. I know

very well that those who can throw their eye over all the possible causes of international misconception may give a very long catalogue of causes of immediate danger; but those apprehensions are not shared by her Majesty's Government. They do not believe that there is any cause for war, or that there is any pretext for war. They believe, on the contrary, that it is the conviction of all those Sovereigns and Ministers who influence the destiny of nations and the course of events, that it is for the advantage of their countries and subjects that peace should be maintained. I admit—because on occasions like the present it is unwise to conceal any cause of anxiety which we may feel—I admit that in the relative position of France and Prussia—two of the most eminent among the civilized and leading countries of Europe—there is apparently cause for anxiety in the great armaments which they now promote. But as in private life we sometimes find that between two high-spirited individuals, without sufficient cause, there are yet some misconceptions for which they themselves believe there is no sufficient foundation—and under these circumstances their equals in rank, their friends, whose motives cannot be misconceived, feel it their duty to interfere, and, by promoting mutual explanations, lead to a more salutary state of sentiment; so I think that in the present state of the affairs of Europe, my noble friend who has so successfully, according to the statement of the Minister of the United States, terminated those difficult and, in some sense, long-enduring misunderstandings with that country, can do no better than confer with the great Powers of Europe. By stepping between those two great countries, who are animated, as I believe, by no aggressive feeling, but occupy the position they do from peculiar causes that could not be anticipated, and which seldom have occurred before—by the wise and generous mediation of the other equal Powers of Europe, I have myself the conviction that as happy a termination will be brought to these misunderstandings as has been brought to the misconceptions between the United States and our own country.” In subsequent observations Mr. Disraeli referred to the coming dissolution, expressed his confidence that the Reform Act (the authorship of which he declined to contend about) would work beneficially, and begged the City of London to recollect that, as great owners of property, they were interested in maintaining the rights of property. “I have never,” said the Premier, in allusion to the approaching elections, “found boastfulness and braggadocio of the slightest utility. Our opponents, indeed, have settled every thing. They have exhausted all the arts of unanimous audacity. But I think I have read somewhere that it is the custom of undisciplined hosts on the eve of a battle to anticipate and celebrate their triumph by horrid sounds and hideous yells, the sounding of cymbals, the beating of drums, the shrieks and springs of barbaric hordes. But when all that has occurred, it is sometimes found that the victory is not to them, but to those who are calm and collected; the victory is to

those who have arms of precision, though they may have made no noise—to those who had the breech-loaders, the rocket brigade, and the Armstrong artillery.” The right hon. gentleman, without entering into details, had perfect confidence in the good sense of the constituencies, and he hoped to have the honour of returning thanks on behalf of her Majesty’s Ministers next year. In proposing the health of the Lord Mayor—who, it must be borne in mind, in order to appreciate the joke, was a Liberal candidate for Lambeth—he said, “You have shown, by your conduct of the business of this evening, how competent you are for the great office which you fill; and I am sure you will give me credit for hearty sincerity when I assure you it is my earnest wish that during the next year you will be able to devote to this great Corporation, of which you are the head, your undivided attention. On my own part, and on the part of her Majesty’s Government, I beg to express our sense of your great courtesy in proposing our health; and, whatever may be the position which either of us respectively may occupy, I trust this will not be the last time that we shall meet under this roof.”

Among the other speakers were the Duke of Cambridge, the Lord Chancellor, and Mr. Gathorne Hardy.

17. DEPARTURE OF THE PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF WALES FOR THE CONTINENT.—The Prince and Princess of Wales, accompanied by Prince Albert Victor, Prince George, and Princess Louisa of Wales, left Marlborough House, en route for the Continent. The suite in attendance consisted of the Marchioness of Carmarthen, General Sir William Knollys, Lieutenant-Colonel Keppel, and Dr. Minter. The Prince and Princess drove to the Charing-cross terminus, where they were met by Prince and Princess Teck, the Danish Minister and Madame Bulow, and Earl and Countess Spencer, who came to take leave of their Royal Highnesses. Mr. Eborall and Mr. Cockburn, of the South-Eastern Railway, were in attendance at the station. The Prince and Princess travelled in a state saloon attached to the ordinary express-train leaving Charing-cross at half-past 8 p.m. Mr. J. P. Knight had charge of the train to Dover. Their Royal Highnesses crossed the Channel in a special steamer to Calais, where they were met by Lord Lyons, who accompanied them to Paris. The Prince and Princess arrived at the Hôtel Bristol on the 18th.

24. OPENING OF THE NEW MEAT MARKET AT SMITHFIELD.—Less than seventeen months ago Mr. H. L. Taylor, chairman of the Markets Improvement Committee of the City Corporation, laid the corner-stone of the New Metropolitan Meat and Poultry Market at Smithfield, and to-day it was opened with a banquet, under the presidency of the Lord Mayor. His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales had been invited to perform the “inaugural” ceremony, but his departure for Denmark prevented his participation in an act which placed at the disposal of the citizens of London a market that will be worthy of the greatest city in the world. The old

Newgate Market has been abolished, and the Smithfield Market has taken its place, to the great advantage not only of the butchers of the Metropolis, but, indirectly, of the three or four millions of consumers also.

26. FEARFUL COLLIERY EXPLOSION NEAR WIGAN.—This explosion was one of the most terrible that has ever visited the district. It was in 1853 that fifty-eight lives were lost at the works of the Ince Hall Coal and Cannell Company, and in the following year eighty-seven poor fellows were suddenly ushered into eternity; and now to those, and to the long list of minor explosions which have since been recorded, has to be added a catastrophe which bids fair to cast into the shade the first mentioned, in the ghastly simplicity of its details and in the length of the list of killed and wounded. Like the Ince Hall calamities, too, this accident occurred in that well-known seam, the Arley, noted for its "fiery" or "gaseous" character, and, as far as could be ascertained, the disaster occurred in spite of all the precautions which are taken by a first-class management.

The explosion occurred about half-past eight o'clock in the morning at Messrs. John Scowcroft and Co.'s (Limited) Springs Colliery, situated close to Hindley Common, and about three miles and a half from the centre of the borough of Wigan. The pits have been sunk about four years, and the shafts descend to the Arley mine, which at this point lies 310 yards below the surface.

About 250 men were employed, and hitherto, notwithstanding the fiery nature of the seam, no explosion involving loss of life had occurred. There were few, if any, old workings to embarrass the engineers; all was straight work, and the seam before had not given off any excessive amount of gas. At six o'clock in the morning the two firemen made the customary examination, and they reported the places were "clean" and in working order. These men about eight o'clock started on their second round, and both fell victims to the deadly choke damp.

On the current of air which was sent down the shaft for ventilation reaching the pit eye it was separated into two streams, one of which proceeded in an easterly and the other in a westerly direction. On the west side over 150 persons were employed, on the east there were about seventy. It was in the second and smaller district that the gas was ignited, and this division of the air-current happily prevented the effects of the explosion from reaching the large body on the other side of the pit. Indeed many of the colliers in this district worked on for a couple of hours unconscious of the catastrophe that had occurred, and one was only made aware of it when he brought his lamp, which had gone out, to the pit eye to be re-lighted. It was, as has been stated, about half-past eight that a cloud of dust and a slight report in the winding-shaft told those on the pit bank that an explosion had occurred. The banksman rushed away at once for the manager, Mr. Southworth, while the under-looker, Ellis Drinnan, jumping upon a cargo of full

tubs just starting from the bottom, was quickly brought to the surface. The hooker-on also tried to get on the cage, but he missed his hold, and, falling back into the "dib hole" or "sumph," was drowned. A pony driver named Yates, twelve years of age, was approaching the pit eye at the time, and he, too, with his pony, was blown into the "dib" and met the same fate as the hooker-on. The effect of the explosion was so to reverse the ventilation as to drive the flames of the furnace at the foot of the upcast shaft along the workings, and the first men who were brought to the bank were a number who were working near this spot, and who had been severely burnt. An exploring party was organized as quickly as possible, the under-looker and Mr. Southworth, the manager, having the control of the arrangements. Volunteers were to be had in abundance, and the parties, as they proceeded, were joined by a number of gentlemen from the adjacent collieries, and about noon by the Government Inspector, Mr. Peter Higson, and his son. It was about seven hours after the explosion that the last body was reached, and the explorers then, dusty and tired, returned to the surface. There were then fifty-five bodies in the outhouse at the colliery. The sumph hole was then examined, and the bulk of the water having been pumped out, the bodies of Yates and another were recovered, and sent to the surface about nine o'clock.

The bodies as they were recovered were taken to a workshop, where a platform of loose boards had been hastily constructed. This was soon filled, and then the remainder of the dead were placed in an adjoining smithy. Large crowds gathered round the place, and many harrowing scenes were witnessed.

Two more bodies were discovered in the mine on the following day, and two died from the injuries that they had received. Thus the total number who lost their lives by the explosion amounted to sixty-one, and there still remained several dangerous cases under the treatment of the surgeon and his assistants. *

The bodies that were most burnt were found in what were known as the dip workings, and in that portion of the pit along which the flames of the furnace were driven when the air current was reversed many were scorched about the head and face, as if they had just been caught by the fire as it passed; nearly all seemed to have left their places, and, after running as far as they could, to have succumbed to the deadly choke damp.

DECEMBER.

5. MUNIFICENT GIFT OF MR. PEARBODY TO THE POOR OF LONDON.
—Mr. Peabody addressed the following letter to his Trustees:—

"London, Dec. 5, 1868.

"My Lord and Gentlemen,—I beg to acquaint you who have so

kindly undertaken the management of the fund set apart under my second deed of gift of the 19th of April, 1866, for the benefit of the poor of London and its vicinity, that, in pursuance of an intention which I have entertained since the creation of that fund, I am desirous now of adding to it a further sum of 100,000*l*.

"In contemplation of this I purchased about three years ago a tract of freehold building land of about fifteen acres in extent at Brixton, near the City of London School, easily accessible, and within a few minutes' walk of frequent trains to and from London. This land has increased in value, and can now be let on building leases of eighty years at rents producing about eight per cent. per annum on the cost, which is 16,285*l*. 17*s*. 3*d*. This land I propose to convey to you with the same powers as are conferred by the deed over the other property of this trust, and with discretion to you either to deal with it as a source of income by letting it or any portion of it on lease, or, should you deem it expedient, to retain it in your own hands as sites for dwellings to be erected by the trust.

"Pursuant to my letter of the 29th of January, 1866, I transferred to you, subject to a contingency therein explained, 5000 shares in the Hudson's Bay Company, which accordingly stand in your names, together with 642 additional shares purchased by the re-investment of the accruing income of the previous 5000. These 5642 shares I have since redeemed, conformably to the deed of the 19th of April, 1866, by the payment of 100,000*l*. on the 1st of February last. I have now to acquaint you that it is my intention, so soon as the necessary deeds can be prepared, to hand the shares over to you, to be retained or dealt with according to your best judgment and discretion. The price of these shares shall be fixed on the 17th inst. by the Stock Exchange sales on that day, when I will hand to you a cheque for the balance, to make the gift a cash value of 100,600*l*.

"This amount will increase my former donation of the Second Trust to 200,000*l*., and, including my gift under the First Trust in March, 1862, of 150,000*l*., a total of 350,000*l*.

"I trust you will see manifested in this further donation an expression of my entire satisfaction with the manner in which you have conducted the affairs of the trusts.

"I am, with great respect, your humble Servant,

"GEORGE PEABODY.

"To the Right Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P. (chairman), his Excellency
Beverly Johnson (United States' Minister), Sir Curtis M. Lampson,
Bart., Sir James Emerson Tennent, Bart., J. S. Morgan, Esq."

Mr. Peabody's donations to the poor of London now amount to 350,000*l*.

7. VIOLENT GALE.—On the preceding night a tremendous gale

raged throughout the kingdom, and especially along the coast, and early this morning it blew a perfect hurricane in the Metropolis, the effects of which were visible at daybreak, most of the thoroughfares being strewed with wreck. The contents of the timber-yard of Messrs. Saxton, in Upper Ground-street, Blackfriars-road, were scattered by the wind. Great piles of deals and other sorts of timber, fifty or sixty feet high, were blown down. On the river several barges were injured or sunk—one of the latter in a dangerous position off the Temple Gardens. Two lightermen in charge of the vessel were drowned. A boat containing two young men was driven against a barge in Battersea Reach and smashed, the young men being drowned. In Denmark-street, Camberwell New-road, a water-cistern was carried three houses off, and fell upon a greenhouse. The roof of a cottage situated at the rear of Thomas-street, Clerkenwell, was blown off, and the occupants were buried in the *débris*, but were got out but little the worse for the occurrence. A stack of chimneys fell through the roof of a house in Clerkenwell, but none of the inmates were injured. The roof of 12, Cupid's-court, Golden-lane, was blown off, and some people in the rooms below were cut and bruised by the falling *débris*. Several houses in Frederick-street, Gray's-inn-road, and the neighbourhood had their chimney-pots blown down; and the top of a house in the Back-road, St. George's-in-the-East, was blown off into the street. In the suburbs great damage was done to property. Further on the outskirts, at Barking Reach, a fishing-smack was wrecked, and two men went down with the vessel. Lofty piles of deals were blown down in the timber-yards at Rotherhithe. On the river, numerous tiers of vessels were secured by additional anchors, but notwithstanding these and other precautions, several broke away, and caused considerable damage to those with which they came in contact. One man was drowned and several greatly injured. The whole of the market-gardens and the low lands of Surrey were in many places two or three feet under water, and carriage-roads in the neighbourhood of Egham were rendered nearly impassable by the great accumulation of water. At Windsor the wind did considerable havoc among the trees in Windsor Park and Forest.

8. SMITHFIELD CLUB CATTLE SHOW.—The "private view" at the Agricultural Hall took place on the 7th, when the Crown Prince of Prussia, accompanied by Viscount Bridport and the Earl of Hardwicke visited the Show, which passed off smoothly and well this year. Even two wet evenings did not damp the comers, who poured in a steady stream through the turn-stiles; and the relaxation of the cattle-plague restrictions, which enabled the country butchers to take their purchases home to kill, sent up beasts nearly 7l. per head in price.

This was also the judging day, and the Birmingham Cup Hereford ox of Mr. William Heath, of Ludlow Hall, Norwich, gained the first prize.

The Herefords were this year the grandest feature of the show; indeed, the old steers formed the only cattle class that earned a general commendation from the judges, though the entries numbered fewer than last year.

Her Majesty gained the first prize for a very handsome Hereford cow, that was placed third at Birmingham.

For Norfolk and Suffolk polled steers and oxen the Prince of Wales won the first prize with a compact very handsome steer, while Mr. William Smith, of Witton, took the second. His Royal Highness was also first for a Norfolk polled heifer.

In addition to the fullest cattle classes that have ever been collected in the Hall, there was this year also a sheep show without precedent in the number of entries, there being about 130 pens, not including the extra stock classes, against less than 100 last year, and between eighty and ninety in the year before that.

There were admitted to the Hall about three thousand persons more than on the corresponding day last year; and during the whole of the day any body who tried to get a good look at a red-riband animal, or to travel in any direction along the galleries, found out how intensely popular was the annual exhibition provided by the Smithfield Club.

The numbers attending the Show on the 10th amounted to nearly the same as on the previous day, when between 38,000 and 39,000 passed through the turn-tables. The sales of prize stock were very numerous, and most of the chief prizes changed hands.

On the fifth and last day the Show was visited by many thousands less than on the previous shilling days, and the sales were very few in number.

It should be mentioned that the police regulations for the prevention of robberies at the Show, which is visited generally by a class of persons who are supposed to be easily robbed, were excellent. At each of the doors detectives were placed, and whenever any of the swell mob or others known to the police came, they were warned from the premises. Before the doors closed many purchasers were taking their prize animals away to the slaughter-house, the regulations requiring that they should be killed, and in a few hours the appearance of the Hall was undergoing a radical change in the preparations being made to convert it into a theatre and circus for the Messrs. Sanger's Christmas stud and spectacle entertainments.

13. DREADFUL ACCIDENT ON THE BRIGHTON RAILWAY.—About three o'clock this morning a lamentable accident occurred at the Three Bridges station, on the main line of the London and Brighton Railway. A down goods train had then arrived at Three Bridges from London, and had been shunted into a siding. It contained a box truck which had been taken on from the North-Western line, and which was destined for Newhaven, most, if not all, of its contents being *in transitu* for France by the Newhaven

route. While the train was standing in the Three Bridges siding, the guard of a Tunbridge Wells train, named Frank French, had his attention directed to a leakage from the box-truck, and, undeterred by the odour of naphtha, entered the truck with his lighted lamp in order to see whence the leakage came, and either by ignition from actual accidental contact, or by an explosive vapour, the cask took fire. There was scarcely any report, but the truck was instantly wrapped in flames, amid which French was enveloped. He managed to get out of the truck, and a fellow-guard, named John Harris, went to his assistance. Harris also was caught by the blazing fluid, and received severe injuries. The porters and officials on duty with the trains, and at the junction, lent, of course, immediate assistance, and both the sufferers were at once sent on to the Brighton Hospital. French was deeply burnt all over his body, and, though sensible and able to hold conversation during the day, died in the night at half-past ten. Harris was very much burnt about the legs and arms. The flames did not spread much. The truck which contained the cask was completely destroyed, with the whole of its contents; and the two adjacent trucks, with what they bore, were also damaged a good deal. The railway servants exerted themselves to the utmost, as well in rescuing, so far as they could, their comrades, as in getting the uninjured part of the train out of harm's way. The cask contained refined naphtha, and the fatality acquired considerable public importance from the fact that the closed truck was booked through from Liverpool to Dieppe, from the North-Western Railway, whereon previous fatalities from petroleum had occurred, including, of course, the Abergele catastrophe. A man who happened to be near at hand said that he heard six distinct explosions. The flames were described as lighting up the locality for miles around. The intensity of the heat was such that the hand lamps held by the deceased and Harris were almost completely fused. The rails were displaced and twisted, and the keys of the main down line, some score yards off, were touched and scorched by the liquid fire. The truck containing the inflammable material and its contents were burnt to what looked like a cinder heap. Harris died subsequently of the injuries he had received.

14. THE QUEEN AT THE PRINCE CONSORT'S MAUSOLEUM.—This being the seventh anniversary of the death of the late Prince Consort, shortly before eleven o'clock the Queen, the Crown Prince and Princess of Prussia, Princes Arthur and Leopold, and Princesses Louise and Beatrice, and the ladies and gentlemen of the Court, proceeded through the private grounds of the palace and the park to the Prince's Mausoleum, at the rear of Frogmore House, where, within the Mausoleum, a special service was commenced by the Dean of Windsor, the choral parts being under the supervision of Dr. Elvey, the organist of St. George's Chapel. The first anthem was a chorale composed by Nicholas Decius in 1549.

liberating the injured persons. From the time the accident happened to the time when all were taken out, about an hour and a half elapsed. No person was killed, but a great many were seriously injured.

28. EXECUTION OF A WOMAN AT LINCOLN.—Priscilla Biggadyke, sentenced to death at the late Lincoln Assizes for the murder of her husband, Richard Biggadyke, at Stickney, near Boston, underwent the extreme penalty of the law at Lincoln Castle. She persisted that she had not committed the crime with which she was charged. The executioner was Askerne, who is frequently retained on these sad occasions in the northern and midland counties. The prisoner was in a very depressed and fainting state when the procession to the scaffold set out, but she appeared to gather more firmness as she went on. On finally parting with the governor and chaplain she shook hands with them. The governor asked her whether she admitted the justice of her sentence. She murmured something—one of the warders thought it was an affirmative reply—but the precise words could not be heard. A few seconds before she had exclaimed—the hope of life apparently still clinging to her—“Oh! you won’t hang me!” Every thing, being, however, in readiness, the executioner proceeded to complete his task, and the wretched woman, after some convulsive struggles, ceased to exist. The execution was conducted in private, in accordance with the recent Act of Parliament.

30. COLLIERY EXPLOSION AT HAYDOCK.—The Wigan coal district was again the scene of a terrible catastrophe, another ignition of fire damp (the third within a month), resulting in the death of twenty-six persons, having occurred. The explosion happened at the collieries of Messrs. Richard Evans and Co., which are situate about the centre of the township of Haydock, three miles from St. Helen’s, and seven from the borough of Wigan, and are known by the name of the Haydock Collieries. The Queen pit is sunk to a depth of 280 yards, and at it are obtained two seams of coal—the Ravenhead main delf and the Wigan nine-foot. It was in the latter where the casualty occurred. About forty men were employed in this mine, but the particular part in which the explosion happened had only been worked about two years, and only twenty-five men were engaged in it. All descended to their work in the morning, but shortly after noon the colliers engaged in some other portions of the pit noticed a derangement of the ventilation, and on examination being made it was found there had been a very serious explosion. Mr. Chadwick, the underground manager, and Mr. Billinge, the under-looker in charge of the nine-foot workings, were at once communicated with, and an exploring party was organized. As soon as the current of air could be restored an examination of the district in which the gas had fired was commenced. The work was one of considerable difficulty, in consequence of the damage done to the stoppings and in the air-ways.

Several persons who had been burnt were found alive, and were removed to the surface, where their injuries were attended to. As the explorers proceeded, they found the bodies of the deceased in the levels, and forwarded them to the surface. Twenty-three bodies were recovered, and during the night a lad who was brought out of the mine early died from the effects of the choke damp.

The explosion was supposed to have occurred about 250 yards from the pit eye, but nothing was known as to how it originated. It was thought, however, that the accumulation of gas had been caused by some derangement of the ventilation, probably in consequence of a fall of roof, or something of that nature. The mine was ventilated in districts, and this will account for only one portion having been affected by the explosion. Altogether about 300 men were engaged in the workings communicating with the shaft.

Mr. Higson, Government Inspector of Mines for this district, and Mr. J. Higson, Deputy-Inspector, were communicated with immediately after the explosion, and about 10 p.m. they reached the pit, and at once descended. They gave the collieries an excellent character, and Mr. Chadwick, the underground manager, was said to be one of the most experienced men in the district.

On the 31st the manager and under-looker, together with the Government inspector and his son, descended the workings, to make a further examination, and two more bodies were recovered.

The Coroner's jury returned a verdict of Accidental Death. They found also that the fire damp was ignited by a "blown-out shot"—that is, a blast of powder, which, instead of taking effect on the rock, blew out of the bore-hole like a charge out of a gun; but whether the fire damp arose from a gradual accumulation through deficient ventilation, or from a sudden escape of gas from the body of the coal, there was no evidence to show.

— CONSECRATION OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.—The ceremony of confirming the election of the Right Rev. Dr. Archibald Campbell Tait, late Bishop of London, to the Archiepiscopal See of Canterbury, was held at the parish church of St. Mary-le-Bow, Cheapside, in the presence of a large number of spectators. His Grace the Archbishop elect arrived at the church at half-past ten o'clock, accompanied by his six chaplains—the Rev. F. G. Blomfield, M.A., Rector of St. Andrew Undershaft; the Rev. Edward Parry, M.A., Rector of Acton; the Rev. E. H. Fisher, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; the Rev. W. F. Erskine Knollys, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Twickenham; the Rev. Arthur Martineau, M.A., Rector of St. Mildred's, Bread-street; and the Rev. C. W. Sandford, M.A., of Christ Church, Oxford; Mr. J. B. Lee, his legal secretary, and Mr. John Hassard, his private secretary. On arriving at Cheapside his Grace was received by the Bishop of Lincoln (who is to be his successor in the diocese of London), the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, the Bishop of Rochester, the Bishop of Hereford, and the Bishop of Peter-

borough, all of whom wore their episcopal robes; Sir Travers Twiss, the vicar-general of the province; Mr. F. Hart Dyke, the registrar; and Mr. Felix Knyvett, the apparitor. Having taken their seats in the church, the Litany was said by the Rev. Marshall Hall Vine, M.A., the Rector, after which the Archbishop left his pew, and took the oaths at a table which was placed in the body of the church.

OBITUARY

OF

EMINENT PERSONS DECEASED IN 1868.

M. BERRYER.

M. PIERRE ANTOINE BERRYER, the glory of the Paris Bar, who died at Angerville on the 29th of November, was the oldest and the ablest advocate still in practice, and his powers as an orator were enhanced by the virtues of his character and the splendid consistency of his career.

He was born at Paris on the 4th of January, 1790, being the son of Pierre Nicolas Berryer, a well-known advocate, and his education was confided to the Oratorians of Juilly, where he developed no little piety of feeling, and desired to enter the Church, but yielded to the wish of his family that he should read for the bar. At first averse from hard study, his success in acquiring a knowledge of the subjects to which he applied himself caused him to devote his attention to them with untiring assiduity, and he soon made himself a master not only of jurisprudence, but of the exact sciences.

Applying himself to his profession with ardour, he not only exerted his powers before the tribunals, but sought to win popularity by public speaking. Throughout his life he was an active and zealous supporter of the Bourbons, and in 1814 he rendered himself famous by announcing the fall of Napoleon, in the presence of the magistrates and law students at Rennes. The prefect ordered his arrest, but he contrived to escape to Nantes. During the Hundred Days he bore arms as a volunteer in defence of the ancient dynasty.

It was in 1815, when associated with his father and M. Dupin in the defence of Marshal Ney, that he gained his first great

triumph as an advocate and an orator. Ney's trial was followed by those of Generals Dobbelle and Cambronne, and young Berryer alone was retained for their defence. His eloquence was powerless to save the former, but was successful in obtaining an acquittal for Cambronne. This victory was the precursor of other similar triumphs, and his attainment of the first rank among legal orators was acknowledged to be only a matter of time.

In 1830 he was elected to the Chamber of Deputies by the department of the Haute Loire, and on the 9th of March in that year he made his first appearance in the tribune, securing to himself as prominent a position in the House as he already held at the bar. After the Revolution of July he frequently spoke in favour of popular government, though he was rightly regarded as the chief of the Legitimist party in Paris. This position exposed him to some danger, for the advisers of the Duchess de Berri determined on an insurrection in 1832, which course Berryer strongly opposed. Armed with a letter from Chateaubriand, he went to La Vendée to urge his views on the Duchess, and to guard against the suspicion of being concerned in their measures he left Paris for Switzerland. He was however arrested at Angoulême and conveyed to Nantes to stand a trial, which took place at Blois on the 16th of October 1832, and led to disclosures concerning the practice of the Government's agents singularly damaging to its popularity. Berryer admitted having gone to La Vendée to see the Duchess, but refused to divulge any particulars of his conversation with her Royal Highness,

save that he had frankly and honestly given her his opinion unfavourable to her projected course of action. Some of the witnesses for the prosecution proved themselves guilty of perjury and forgery, the result being that the Crown counsel threw up the case in an agony of shame, leaving Berryer to rejoice in a triumphant acquittal.

D'Argenson, De Puyraveau, and Garnier Pagès reaped the advantages of Berryer's advocacy on their trials in 1834-5. In 1836 the French Legitimists subscribed a large sum, with which they purchased the estate of Angerville, as a tribute to the brilliant orator who had so boldly and so successfully raised his voice in their defence.

At the trial of Louis Napoleon for his attempt upon Boulogne in 1840 Berryer made a powerful speech in his defence, contending that as 4,000,000 of votes had placed the Napoleon dynasty on the throne, Prince Louis was in fact the heir to that throne.

Berryer was almost a passive spectator of the events of 1848, but was chosen in that year, and again in 1849, representative in the Legislature of the Bouches du Rhône. In the Republican Parliament he spoke but little save upon financial and administrative questions, but he was opposed to the conduct of the President Louis Napoleon, and spoke against it in 1851. In the same year he protested against a proposal for repealing the law which exiled the Bourbons, on the ground that the Count de Chambord was not an exiled Frenchman, but a King of France unlawfully excluded from the throne, and that no monarch could accept permission to enter his own dominions. Berryer was among those who endeavoured to procure the impeachment of Louis Napoleon, but, after the *coup d'état* of the 2nd of December, 1851, which he had foreseen and worked against, Berryer took little part in political matters, except in endeavouring to effect a fusion between the two branches of the House of Bourbon. In 1852 he was elected *bâtonnier* of the French bar, and in 1854 became an Academician, on which occasion he did not pay the usual visit to the Emperor. In 1858 he was chosen by the Count de Montalembert to defend him on his trial for the famous article upon a debate on India in the British Parliament. Montalembert was sentenced to fine and imprisonment, but the Emperor would not allow the latter part of the sentence to be carried out. In 1861 he was engaged in the celebrated cause of Miss Patterson concerning the succession of Jerome Napoleon. In 1863 Berryer permitted himself to be

put in nomination for the department of the Bouches du Rhône, and was elected by his old constituency, M. Thiers and M. Marie being his colleagues.

In 1865 he paid a visit to England as the guest of Lord Brougham, and was entertained at a special banquet given in his honour at the Temple by the Benchers on the 10th of November, where the highest compliments were paid to the great French advocate, who had all through life maintained a thoroughly consistent course.

M. Berryer did not take a very active part in the debates of the Parliament of the Second Empire, but he raised his voice in the Chamber in December, 1867, in approval of the French intervention in Rome; and on the 14th of February, 1868, he made a long speech in the Corps Législatif to sustain an amendment, designed to secure the independence of the judges, which he had proposed to a new law on the press. His last political act was his publicly subscribing to the fund raised to defend the Paris journals which were prosecuted for having published lists of subscriptions for a monument to Baudin, one of the victims of the *coup d'état* of 1852.

A writer in the *Times* remarks that M. Berryer had "long been considered the foremost orator of France since the days of Mirabeau; and his speeches had in them at once all the charm of finished orations and the force of the suddenness, vivacity, and fire of extempore harangues. There are those who have compared him to Lord Derby, or rather to the Lord Stanley of a quarter of a century ago; of whose vehement and impassioned manner he reminded English hearers; especially when, confident of some advantage gained over his opponent in debate, he would heap refutations, sarcasms, and taunts on his discomfited adversary. When he stood at the Tribune, with his head raised, and his arm uplifted, and poured forth his torrent of eloquence, nothing could be superior to him in style or in action. Possessing a most musical voice, and thoroughly gifted with every oratorical resource, he was listened to with profound silence, broken by applause only at the end of some fine period. Add to this the fact that he had an astonishing aptitude for business, and an intuitive quickness in mastering the details of the most complicated questions, and the reader may have an idea of the versatile and powerful orator whom France has lost."

SIR DAVID BREWSTER, D.C.L., &c.

Sir David Brewster, Principal of the University of Edinburgh, and one of the

first natural philosophers of his age, died at his seat of Allerly, near Melrose, on the 10th of February in the 87th year of his age. He was born at Jedburgh, on the 11th of December, 1781. His father, who was rector of the grammar school there, destined him for the ministry; and he was accordingly sent to the University of Edinburgh, and maintained there for several sessions, during which his performances as a student were promising and even brilliant. He passed through the theological classes, and took licence as a preacher of the Church of Scotland; but he was strongly attracted during his college career towards the study of science and the observation of natural phenomena, and at last he resolved to turn completely to the pursuit of science as his aim in life, and in that spirit declined a presentation which was offered to him by the Duke of Roxburgh. He had received the honorary degree of M.A. in 1800; and at and after that period he enjoyed the acquaintance and assistance in his scientific studies—in which he already gave evidence of surpassing powers of observation—of Robison, the Professor of Natural Philosophy, and of Playfair and Dugald Stewart. He had already so far improved upon the instructions he had received, that in maturely examining the bases of Newton's theory of light he succeeded in discovering a novel and important fact in optics—that of the influence of the condition of the surfaces of bodies on the "inflection" or change of direction of the rays of light, which had been formerly accepted as a consequence of the nature of the bodies themselves. He had already devoted himself principally to the science of optics, in which he was destined to attain so distinguished a reputation. In 1807 a number of honours poured in upon him. He was made LL.D. of Aberdeen University; Oxford conferred on him the degree of D.C.L.; and Cambridge that of A.M. Next year Dr. Brewster was elected a member of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, of which he subsequently filled the offices of secretary, vice-president, and president—holding the latter office at his death; and in the same year he took in hand the task of editing the "Edinburgh Encyclopædia," a work to which he made a number of important and interesting scientific contributions, and which he did not complete till 1830. This considerable undertaking, however, was far from occupying the whole of Dr. Brewster's almost marvellous working energy. In 1813, under the title of a "Treatise on New Philosophical Instruments," &c., he presented to the public some of the results of his optical researches during the preceding twelve years. In 1811 he had

bestowed some attention upon the experiments prosecuted by Buffon with the purpose of discovering the nature and emulating the effects of the burning-mirrors of Archimedes; and these experiments suggested to him the construction of what he styled "polyzonal" lenses. Lighthouses at that time were usually fitted up with plain parabolic reflectors; Dr. Brewster proposed instead the use of lenses built up of zones of glass, each of which might be composed of several circular segments, arranged concentrically round a central disc, with the effect of strengthening the light and transmitting it to a greater distance. The invention, or adaptation of Buffon's invention, excited a good deal of interest at the time, as it promised to lead to an improvement in the illumination of our lighthouses and the safe conduct of our coast navigation; but it was not then practically taken up in this country, though it was in France. In 1815, at the desire of the Corporation of Edinburgh and of Professor Playfair, he undertook to take the place of the latter in delivering the lectures on natural philosophy; but he did not long persist in this task, grudging every moment and every effort that did not lead him further in the investigation and knowledge of this favourite subject. In the same year he sent again to the Royal Society of London a paper "On the Polarization of Light by Reflection," and the society elected him a Fellow, and voted him their Copley medal for his discoveries and researches. In 1816 he had the honour to receive from the French Institute half of the prize of 3000*fr.* awarded for the two most important discoveries made in Europe in physical science during the two years preceding. In that year also he achieved the invention which has rendered his name most popular—that of the kaleidoscope.

Thenceforward honours continued to flow in rapidly on him, and in 1831 he received the decoration of the Guelphic Order of Hanover. The year following he was knighted by King William IV. In 1833 he was a candidate for the chair of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh, but was defeated by Mr. J. B. Forbes, now Principal Forbes, of St. Andrew's. To the distinctions we have enumerated as falling to his share the King of Prussia added (in 1847) the Order of Merit. In 1849 he was elected of the foreign Associate Members of Institute of France, and the Emperor Napoleon (in 1855) conferred upon him the cross of the Legion of Honour. The list of Sir David Brewster's contributions to scientific and general literature is very extensive.

Among his more popular works were a

"Treatise on the Kaleidoscope," a "Treatise on Optics," "Letters on Natural Magic," "The Martyrs of Science," and "More Worlds than One," written in reply to Dr. Whewell's "Plurality of Worlds." He was twice married—in 1810 to Juliet, the younger daughter and co-heiress of James Macpherson, of Belleville, M.P., better known to fame as the "translator" or author of "Ossian." The first Lady Brewster died in 1850; and in 1857 Sir David was again married, to Jane, daughter of Mr. Thomas Parnell, of Scarborough, who survived him.

SIR JAMES BROOKE.

Sprung from a good old Somersetshire family, and the son of a plain retired official who had acquired a handsome competency in the civil service of the East India Company, James Brooke was born, either in India, or, according to another account, at Combe Grove, near Bath, on the 29th of April, 1803. His love of adventure, and more especially of Eastern adventure, was remarkable even when a child, and it is not to be wondered at that as soon as he grew towards manhood he should have chosen the Indian army as his profession. He obtained his first commission about the year 1817, and served as a cadet in the first Burmese war, in which he was severely wounded, and shortly afterwards obtained his lieutenancy. After his return to England, upon the death of his father, an accident occurred which altered the whole course of his subsequent life. On recovering from his wound he travelled through France and Italy to re-establish his health; but on reaching India he found that his furlough had expired, and that he was obliged to retire from the service, although he was able to plead in excuse the fact that he had been wrecked on his outward passage, and that he was scarcely accountable for the delay. Accordingly he sailed from Calcutta in the "Royalist" yacht, which, as being attached to the Royal Yacht Squadron, was entitled in foreign ports to the same privileges as a man-of-war. With a fine active crew of twenty men, after more than three years' sailing and cruising in the Mediterranean and other European seas, during which he was training them for greater things—he left the Thames on the 27th of October, 1838, and steered straight for those Eastern seas of which he had read as a child, and which he now resolved to penetrate again. He passed the southern shores of India and Ceylon, crossed the Indian Ocean, and speedily landed at Singapore. This was in July, 1839; and he reached Sarawak, which

lies a few leagues up country from the sea-coast of Borneo, in the following month.

On reaching the coast of Borneo he found the Sovereign or Sultan of that island engaged in a long and almost hopeless attempt to subdue one of the rebellions which so frequently happen among the rival rulers of subordinate districts. What he could not do in four years Brooke helped him to do in as many months, if not in as many weeks. His aid was solicited by and given to the Rajah Muda Hassim; and it secured the triumph of authority and law. It appears that Muda soon afterwards being called to the post of Prime Minister, recommended the Sultan to make the English adventurer his successor as Rajah of Sarawak. The advice thus tendered was accepted, and the honour and dignity of Rajah was laid at the feet of the Englishman. When the news came to England that he had taken an active and successful part in the suppression of the Malay pirates, and that the Prince had ceded to him the territory of Sarawak as the representative of England, James Brooke became a popular idol. This was in 1841; and his official proclamation as Governor of Sarawak dates from the 21st of September, 1841, on which day the British flag was hoisted there.

The newly-appointed Rajah immediately set about the reform of the local Government, the framing of new laws, and the improvement of the people thus strangely subjected to the all but irresponsible sway of the "Tuan Besar," or great man, as the natives persisted in calling him, both absent and present, saluting even his picture with a prostration greater and more marked than that with which a pious Roman Catholic would honour the picture of his patron saint. In certain expeditions which he undertook for the purpose of suppressing piracy and slavery, which had always been the chief aim of his existence, he was largely assisted by the Hon. Captain Keppel, R.N., and by Sir Thomas Cochrane, who then held the command-in-chief over the fleet in Eastern waters. The result of these expeditions was the shedding of a great deal of blood; but it was said that those who perished were freebooters and pirates, and the outcry raised in consequence against the Rajah gradually died away. Captain Keppel, who had taken so active a part in the suppression of piracy, on his return to England in 1844 published a "Diary" by the Rajah himself, which rendered the public at home familiar with the true state of the case, and prepared them to welcome him on his return with suitable demonstrations of their feelings. On reaching London in 1846, or early in 1847, Rajah Brooke

found himself famous, and more than famous; the Knighthood of the Bath (civil order) was conferred on him by her Majesty; the University of Oxford bestowed on him the honorary degree of D.C.L.; and he was fêted and entertained at dinner by every public body, from the Queen, at Windsor Castle, down to the most third-rate and fourth-rate of city companies. He also reaped the more solid and substantial rewards of being created by the Queen "Commissioner and Consul to the Native States of Borneo, and Governor of Labuan," the latter being a small island near Sarawak, purchased from the Sultan and erected into a British colony. Governor he enjoyed a salary of 2000*l.* a year.

It is not to be supposed that all this time he had no zealous opponents or detractors from the credit and the fame which were his due, and more than once Mr. Joseph Hume was defeated in an attempt to procure from the House of Commons what in effect would have been equivalent to a censure on his conduct; the same gentleman also printed privately, and circulated widely, a pamphlet embodying many charges against him, which were for the most part capable of disproof on a closer inspection. Ultimately, however, a commission of inquiry into his conduct was appointed, which, although it came to little or nothing, yet laid the foundation of great mental suffering and bodily illness in a man like Brooke, whose sensitive and chivalrous nature, as Edmund Burke so pointedly said, "feels a stain as a wound." At a public dinner, however, at the London Tavern, the merchants of the city, generals, and admirals, and lawyers and East Indian directors, and statesmen of every shade of party, met to do him honour, and to bear public testimony to their full approval of the work he had done in the East, and their entire belief in the honesty and justice of his policy.

The rest of the ex-Rajah's story is soon told. In 1858 he returned to England, but he had been in this country only a few months when his health received a serious shock in the shape of a paralytic attack. From this he ultimately rallied, though for some months he was rendered incapable of active mental or bodily exertion; and, to add to his troubles, in the following year he received the intelligence that his books and private papers had been destroyed in an insurrection in Borneo, which he was not on the spot to quell. A public meeting, however, was held in London, and a large sum was collected among his friends and admirers in order to enable him to replace them and to purchase the estate in the south of Devonshire, where his latter days were spent, and where he

died on the 11th of June. Towards the close of 1861 he paid Borneo a visit, accompanied by Mr. Spencer St. John; but he had the mortification of finding the north-west part of the island in rebellion. As soon as this outbreak was suppressed he returned to England, but was again recalled to the East by fresh complications which had arisen in the internal administration of Borneo. These difficulties, however, he had the satisfaction of seeing arranged on his farewell visit to the island about five years since. From that date the fortunes of Borneo and of Sarawak have been on the whole peaceful and quiet. Brooke, though himself placed on a sort of honorary retired list, saw the independence of his favourite settlement recognized by the British Government, and a British consul established there. The Rajah was, both at home and abroad, much and deservedly respected. His name indeed merits a place in history; for all must agree in admitting that he rendered immense services to the country with which his career will be indelibly associated.

LORD BROUGHAM.

It was from the union of a Westmoreland squire and a Scotch lady that one of the most remarkable men who have passed from the English bar and the Lower House to the woolsack and the peerage derived his birth; on one side the grace of antiquity, on the other that of literature, illustrated his origin. The family of Burgham, or Brougham, though not adequately represented by his immediate ancestors, traced its descent beyond the Conquest to Anglo-Saxon times. The maiden name of his mother was Eleanor Syme; her father was a doctor of divinity; her uncle, Principal Robertson, or, more aptly to the Southern ear, Robertson the Historian. The northern relationship, or the advantages offered by Edinburgh as a place of Education, gave to Scotland more than a nominal share in the fame afterwards acquired. In St. Andrew's-square, in that city, on the 19th of September, 1778, Henry Brougham, one of five sons, entered on no common pilgrimage; and the larger part of his youth and early manhood was spent in the place of his nativity. The High School, then presided over by Dr. Adam, was his first arena. Walter Scott and Francis Jeffrey were among his immediate predecessors on the floor. The University course followed, with its larger scope, when he was fifteen. Black's chymistry, Robinson's natural philosophy, Tytler's history, Playfair's mathematics, the moral and political philosophy of Dugald Stewart, laid the

foundation of that sturdy and practised intellect, whose force and whose furniture were not ill-proportioned to one another.

Within the compass of a short notice it is impossible to do justice to the character of a man so many-sided in his aspects, so multifarious in his tastes and studies, so superhuman in his energy and industry. He was almost every thing in turn—a mathematician, an historian, a biographer, an essayist and reviewer, a physical philosopher, a moral and political philosopher, an educator of the people, a lawyer, an orator, a statesman, a philanthropist.

His capacity and his ambition alike determined him to a sphere where tongue and pen could find play. Before the last century had run out he was called to the Scotch bar. In the biding time of that profession (no such long delay for him) he found room for exertion and conflict along with the other "strong spirits" who devised the *Edinburgh Review*. He was one of that choice coterie who, in the year 1802, met, as Sydney Smith describes, in the upper flat, where Jeffrey began so modestly his married life, and vowed to revolutionize more than one phase of British opinion.

As early as 1803 we find intimations that the young advocate had made up his mind to seek before long a wider sphere than Edinburgh could afford, and in 1804 the public career of Henry Brougham had by his removal to London its true commencement. He was called to the English bar by the Hon. Society of Lincoln's Inn in 1808, went the Northern Circuit, and soon got into great business. On Circuit, as in London, he was an energetic and powerful defender of persons charged with political offences. In 1810 he was elected M.P. for the borough of Camelford, and on June 15 in that year he moved an address to the Crown on the subject of the slave trade, the abolition of which he ever after strenuously advocated. He soon became accustomed to the new arena into which his abilities had called him. When he spoke he delivered himself with a daring vehemence and an unexampled fluency. On rolled the stream of his eloquence, strong from conviction, vehement from passion, and burning with invective, as the occasion demanded. Brougham made flogging in the army the subject of one of his most brilliant speeches in the House of Commons that year. Up to October, 1812, he was a frequent speaker in the House—on Colonel M'Mahon's sinecure, the King's Household Bill, the East India Company's affairs, corporal punishment in the army, the Roman Catholic claims, &c. He vigor-

ously opposed the leather tax, which the Ministers only carried by a majority of eight. In this year, also, he procured the rescinding of the obnoxious Orders in Council so far as America was concerned, and was invited to stand for Liverpool. He did so, and after a hard canvass was defeated by Mr. Canning. In 1816 he was returned for Winchelsea. The splendour and versatility of his talents were now universally acknowledged. From this time he took a decided lead in the House, and maintained unflinchingly the up-hill game peculiarly suited to his nature. With his force his failings began to be more apparent. The north-country elements, bad and good, made themselves day by day more notorious. The prize-fighter's pluck, the unyielding pertinacity, the unrestrained expression, the uncouth gesticulations, created at once respect and ridicule. The "blundering Brougham" of Byron's angry iambics grew into the "blustering Brougham" of the Tory journals. For thirteen years he waged the Parliamentary warfare in the fiercest style—repeated his motions, multiplied his speeches, crowded his illustrations sharpened his taunts, emphasized his periods, intruded his anecdotes, flung down his facts. He was the most constant, the most successful, the most humorous speaker in the House, and at the same time the most elastic and unextinguishable, but his tact and his manner were far inferior to his talent, and his appearance, at once highly remarkable and absurdly ungainly, seemed to justify the distortions of the caricaturists and the lampoons of the ballad-makers:—

"A meagre form, a face so wondrous thin
That it resembles Milton's Death and Sin;
Long arms that saw the air like windmill
sails,
And tongue whose force and fury never
fails."

In 1817 he commenced his untiring and disinterested labours in the cause of education. On May 21 of that year he obtained a Committee of the House on the subject, and was its chairman. He presented the report on June 20. In the same Session he opposed the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and took part in nearly every discussion of importance. His educational labours were his great achievement in 1818. A Committee formed by his endeavours advocated the appointment of paid commissioners of charities. The Bill for the purpose, altered in some respects, received the Royal assent June 10, 1818. In this Session Mr. Brougham delivered a speech on Parliamentary reform.

In 1820 he was called upon, as her

Attorney-General, to lead the defence of Queen Caroline, and this famous trial greatly increased his popularity. The year 1823 is remarkable in Mr. Brougham's life for two incidents, a fracas with Mr. Canning and the establishment of the London Mechanics' Institution. In 1824 he spoke often on the delays in Chancery. The year following Mr. Brougham was elected Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow. The next year was remarkable for his able advocacy of the claim of prisoners on trial for capital offences to be defended by counsel; but the Bill was rejected by a majority of sixty-nine, and the right not conceded till 1836. In 1827 he was mainly instrumental in establishing the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. In Trinity Term of that year he received a patent of precedence at the Bar. He spoke in the Session of 1827 on the Catholic claims and the corn laws. In the spring of 1828 he made his celebrated six-hours' speech on the reform of the law. In the Session of 1829 he advocated the Catholic Relief Bill. In the early part of the Session of 1830 he had brought in his Bill for the establishment of county courts, a grand step in law reform, which he saw carried after a lapse of sixteen years. At the dissolution of Parliament in 1830 he stood for the county of York, and was returned. His great speech against the slave trade did much to procure his election. On November 22, 1830, Brougham became Lord Chancellor, and was created Baron Brougham and Vaux; and on the evening of the day on which he took his seat he laid on the table an enormous plan of law reform. He remained on the woolsack throughout the agitation of the Reform Bill, and was the chief hero of its success. In 1835 a change occurred, when Lord Melbourne became Premier and Lord John Russell Home Secretary. From this Government Lord Brougham was excluded; but upon what grounds has never been clearly ascertained. From that time he was never invited to join any of the numerous Administrations which have been formed. Thus kept aloof from political power, Lord Brougham devoted himself thenceforth principally to legal and domestic reforms. Lord Brougham's subsequent life was the chief period of his literary productiveness. He had been making free use of his power of composition through the whole course of his political career; newspapers, reviews, encyclopædias had been under obligations to his versatility. His principal works were "Dissertations on Subjects of Science Connected with Natural Theology," "Lives of Statesmen," "Political Philosophy," "Lives of Men of Letters," "Dialogue on

Instinct;" "A Treatise on the Era of the Civil Wars of England and France, the Era of the Usurper Henry and his Militant Successor;" published letters, the chief one being to the Duke of Bedford on "National Education," in 1839; one to Sir James Graham on "Law Reforms," in 1843; to Lord Lyndhurst on "Criminal Police and the Treatment of Juvenile Offenders," in 1847; on "The French Revolution of 1848," to Lord Lansdowne; and to Lord Denman on "The Legislation of 1850." Lord Brougham's last years were passed in seclusion and failing health, and his principal enjoyment seems to have been derived from his constant visits to his residence at Cannes, where he died on the 7th of May. In connexion with the chief acts of his later life may be mentioned his able and zealous presidency of the Law Amendment Society and its ally the Social Science Association. As their president he introduced the celebrated French advocate, M. Berryer, who was splendidly entertained by the English Bar in the Middle Temple Hall in 1864.

On March 22, 1860, Lord Brougham obtained another peerage patent giving him the same title, but with limitation to his fourth brother, William Brougham, Esq., and the heirs male of his body. Lord Brougham married Mary Anne, eldest daughter of Thomas Eden, Esq., granddaughter of Sir Robert Eden, third Baronet, West Auckland, in the county of Durham, niece of the first Lords Auckland and Henry, and widow of John Spalding Esq., of The Holmes, Scotland, by whom (who died January 12, 1865) he had two daughters, Eleanor Sarah, died an infant, 1820, and Eleanor Louisa, born October, 1822, died November 30, 1839.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

The Right Hon. and Most Rev. Charles Thomas Longley, D.D., P.C., Archbishop of Canterbury, who died of bronchitis on the 27th of October, at Addington Park, Surrey, was the son of John Longley, Esq., barrister-at-law, and Recorder of Rochester, by his wife, Elizabeth, daughter of J. Bond, Esq., of Battersea-rise. He was born July 28, 1794, and was educated at Westminster School, and Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated in 1816, with a first class in classics, and was subsequently college tutor, censor, and public examiner. He was ordained in 1819, and was appointed to the Perpetual Curacy of Cowley, Oxford, in 1823. He was shortly afterwards nominated to the Rectory of West Tytherley, Hants, which preferment he held till 1829, when he was elected

Head Master of Harrow School, and in the same year graduated D.D. He, in 1836, was consecrated first Bishop of Ripon; he was translated to the see of Durham in 1856; to the archbishopric of York in 1860; and to the archiepiscopal and primatial see of Canterbury in 1862. The Archbishop was eminently distinguished for his piety, his devotion to the interests of religion, and for his amiable and benevolent disposition. He did not much appear before the public out of the range of his ecclesiastical functions, yet he had high scholastic qualifications, and as an author he is chiefly known by his collected charges to the clergy of Ripon from 1838 to 1853; by the sermon he published for the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, printed in the Report for 1842; and by other sermons and several letters on religious subjects.

His Grace married the Hon. Caroline Sophia, daughter of Henry Brooke, first Lord Congleton, by whom (who died March 9, 1858) he left issue two sons and three daughters.

THE EARL OF CARDIGAN, K.C.B.

James Thomas Brudenell, seventh Earl of Cardigan, and Baron Brudenell, K.C.B., who died of injuries received in a fall from his horse on the 28th of March, was the eldest surviving son of Robert, sixth Earl, by Penelope Anne, second daughter of the late Mr. George John Cooke, of Harefield Park, Middlesex, and was born at Hambleton, Hants, on the 16th of October, 1797. Having spent a few terms at Christ Church, Oxford, he was elected to Parliament a few months before he came of age, and sat for Marlborough from 1818 until 1829, when the Duke of Wellington's Administration brought in the Catholic Emancipation Bill. Differing from Lord Ailesbury, by whose influence he had been first brought into public life, Lord Cardigan then resigned his seat for Marlborough, and sat for Fowey, in Cornwall, till the Reform Bill passed, after which, in December, 1832, he was returned for the northern division of Northamptonshire with Lord Milton, after a tremendous contest. While he represented Marlborough an incident very rare in the history of Parliament occurred. Lord Brudenell had to vacate his seat on the acceptance of a cornetcy in the 8th Hussars. Of course, it is needless to say he was re-elected. But it is only the original commission that vacates the seat. A man generally enters the army some years before he does the House of Commons, but Lord Brudenell did not enter the army till he was twenty-seven or twenty-eight years of age. In 1832 he

was promoted from half-pay to the Lieutenant-Colonelcy of the 15th Hussars, a regiment with which his name will long be associated as the most unpopular of commanding officers. He quitted the 15th Hussars on account of a personal quarrel; and in 1836 we find him appointed to the command of the 11th Hussars. It would be useless to recall here the memory of the mess-room feuds between himself and Captain Reynolds, which filled the newspapers of the time, and have since been well-nigh forgotten. It is more to the purpose to place upon record the fact that he always kept his regiment in a high state of discipline and efficiency. His duel with Captain Tuckett, fought on Wimbledon Common, on the 10th of September, 1840, in which he slightly wounded his adversary, arose, though somewhat remotely, out of the differences which had existed between himself and Captain Reynolds, and he had to answer the charge of "feloniously shooting" his opponent before the Upper House in the following February, the House of Lords sitting for the purpose as a Criminal Court for the first time after an interval of more than sixty years. The prosecution was conducted by Sir John Campbell, afterwards Lord Chancellor, as Attorney-General; but the House, upon an absurd technical deficiency of proof, unanimously declared his Lordship "Not Guilty," the Lord High Steward broke his staff of office, and the proceedings came to an end.

On the formation of the army for the invasion of the Crimea Lord Cardigan was appointed to command the Light Cavalry Brigade as Major-General. He was employed by Lord Raglan while at Varna in reconnoitring the outposts of the Russians near the mouth of the Danube, and took a prominent part in the early actions of the Crimean campaign. His personal gallantry at Balaklava, when he charged the Russians at the head of his brigade, forcing his way with about 600 cavalry through some 3600 of the enemy, and leaving half of his men and horses dead upon the field, will long be remembered when the controversy as to the mistaken order in obedience to which he led the charge in the teeth of the enemy's guns is forgotten. On returning home from the Crimea Lord Cardigan was appointed Inspector-General of Cavalry, a post which he resigned in 1860. He had already (in 1859) been appointed to the Colonelcy of the 5th Dragoon Guards, from which he was transferred in August, 1860, to the command of his old and favourite Regiment, the 11th (Prince Albert's Own) Hussars. He was nominated a K.C.B. in 1855, and was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant-General in 1861.

The Earl was twice married—first, in 1826, to Elizabeth Jane Henrietta, eldest daughter of the late Vice-Admiral John Richard Delap Tollemache, whose previous marriage with Mr. Johnstone had been dissolved, and shortly after her death, in 1858, to Adeline Louisa Maria, only daughter of the late Mr. Spencer Horsey De Horsey, M.P., and granddaughter of the late Earl of Stradbroke, but had no children by either marriage.

LORD CRANWORTH.

Robert Monsey Rolfe, Baron Cranworth, of Cranworth, in the county of Norfolk, the elder and only surviving son of the Rev. Edmund Rolfe, was born on the 18th of December, 1790. His father, like his uncle, grandfather, and great-grandfather, was a plain country clergyman, holding the livings of Cockley-Cley and of Cranworth, near Shipdham, and it was at the rectory-house of the last-named parish that the late Lord Chancellor was born and from which he selected his title just sixty years afterwards. His mother was a Miss Alexander, and granddaughter of Dr. Monsey, the physician of Chelsea Hospital, whose surname was borne as a second baptismal name by the subject of this memoir.

Having received his early education at the Grammar School of Bury St. Edmund's, which at that time enjoyed a very high local reputation, young Rolfe was transferred to Winchester College. In due course of time he exchanged Winchester for Cambridge. His undergraduate career, like that of his school days, was marked by satisfactory, though not brilliant, results; and it was probably with entire satisfaction to himself that, having taken his B.A. degree as seventeenth among the "Wranglers," in 1812, he found himself elected to a Fellowship at Downing College, which offered him a provision while studying for one of the learned professions, and had the additional advantage, rarer then than in these days, of being tenable without the necessity of taking holy orders. Robert Rolfe now resolved to seek his fortunes at the bar, and therefore came to London and entered himself as a student of Lincoln's Inn. In 1816 he was "called," and the Equity Bar was his choice. Here his early progress was slow, but not slower, perhaps, than the first steps of John Scott, when he first put his foot on the ladder which ultimately led him to the Chancellorship and the Earldom of Eldon. A few years passed, and briefs, which at first were scarce, began to come in more frequently. He had good practical sense and a sound knowledge of the law—if not

in its great and leading principles, at all events in its minutiae and technicalities. He had good connexions among the solicitors; he had also the highest reputation for honour, integrity and good faith, and, above all things, great faith in himself. Some years passed by, and just as his legal reputation was beginning to consolidate itself, he had the satisfaction of being appointed to the Recordership of Bury St. Edmund's, a town of which he more than once contested the representation in the Liberal interest against the strong and all-prevailing influence of the Marquis of Bristol. He obtained the honour of a silk gown from Lord Brougham in 1832; but it was not till the end of the same year that he was enabled to secure a seat in the House of Commons. In the December next after the passing of the first Reform Bill, we find him elected for Penryn, where he helped to eject the candidate, the late Mr. J. W. Freshfield, and he secured his re-election at the general election of December, 1834, and of July, 1837. He had not held a seat in the House for two years, when Sir John Campbell's promotion from Solicitor to Attorney-General left the former post at the disposal of Lord Melbourne's ministry. There were other Liberal barristers, in and out of Parliament, to some of whom it was generally thought that the post would have been offered in preference to Rolfe; but Lord Melbourne and his friends wished for a sound and safe man, a Liberal but not a Radical, and above all things a man of high personal character and standing, both with the profession and the public. These conditions they felt were amply united in Mr. Rolfe, who accordingly, in the summer of 1834, became Solicitor-General, and received the honour of knighthood. His tenure of office, however, was brief, as Lord Melbourne resigned after Lord Spencer's death in the following October or November, which broke up the Whig party, in the old King's opinion at least. The eclipse of the Liberals however was but temporary. Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington contrived, indeed, to form a Ministry; but they were beaten on the Speakership at the meeting of Parliament in 1835. After a three or four months' struggle against an adverse majority they tendered their resignations; and Lord Melbourne's return to Downing-street was the signal for a restoration of Sir Robert Rolfe to his former post. This he held, quietly and conscientiously discharging its duties, until the close of the year 1839, when he accepted a Puisne Judgeship as one of the Barons of the Exchequer.

As a Judge he gave great satisfaction.

Honest, painstaking, conscientious, upright, and gifted with that quiet practical ability for the discharge of work which is often of greater value than the most brilliant talents. He certainly more than justified his appointment. The rest of the late ex-Chancellor's history is soon told. In 1850, when the Great Seal was placed in commission, it was entrusted to him conjointly with Lord Langdale and with Vice-Chancellor Sir Lancelot Shadwell, on whose death, a few weeks afterwards, he was nominated one of the Vice-Chancellors of the kingdom. This post he exchanged in the following year for that of one of the Justices of Appeal in Chancery, which he continued to hold until the Great Seal of the kingdom was entrusted to his hands by Lord Aberdeen on the formation of the Coalition Cabinet in December, 1852. He had already been sworn a member of the Privy Council on first becoming a Vice-Chancellor, and in the same year he was raised to the peerage which became extinct by his death.

It remains only to add that Lord Cranworth again held the Great Seal in 1865-6, in the interval between Lord Westbury's retirement and the return of Lord Derby to power in the latter year. If nothing else can be recorded of him, at all events it may be stated here that he was mainly, if not wholly, instrumental in effecting one legal change, which, it may be presumed, has been acceptable to the profession; we allude to the transfer of the sittings of the Equity Courts from Westminster to Lincoln's Inn.

He died after a short illness at his town house, 40, Upper Brook-street, on the 26th of July. Lord Cranworth married, when pretty well advanced in age, a Miss Carr of Hampstead, a lady whose death preceded his by some five or six months.

SIR HERBERT EDWARDES, K.C.B.

Major-General Sir Herbert Edwardes, K.C.B., and Knight Companion of the Star of India, who died at the early age of forty-nine, in London, on December 23, was the son of the Rev. Benjamin Edwardes, and was born at the close of 1819. He was wounded at Moodkee when aide-de-camp to Lord Gough, and before he was thirty years of age won for himself a distinguished reputation by his conduct while an Assistant-Commissioner attached to the Lahore Mission. The rebellion of Dewan Moolraj of Mooltan against his own Sikh Government broke out in May, 1848. Lieutenant Edwardes was then at Derah Futeh Khan, on the Indus, with one regiment of the Lahore troops and 800 horse. His first movement was for the rescue of the British

Envoys, Messrs. Agnew and Anderson, who, however, had been assassinated on the 18th of April. On ascertaining they were murdered he resolved upon raising levies from the border tribes of the Sooleiman mountains, and occupying as much of the rebel provinces as possible; and to collect the revenues and pay his troops from the enemy's resources. Volunteers flocking to his standard in large numbers, he determined to endeavour to shut up the rebel Moolraj in the fortress of Mooltan till a British force arrived. The Nawab of Bhawalpore, who tendered his aid, was requested to cross the Sutlej, and threaten Mooltan from the east, while Edwardes advanced with his levies from the west. Thus was covered and occupied a territory producing an annual value of eight lacs of rupees. On the 20th of May Colonel Cortlandt, an officer in the Sikh service, came up with the Sikh garrison of Dera Ismail Khan, about 4000 men, and some guns; and the Bhawalpore troops having been attacked by the rebel Moolraj on the 18th of June at Keneyree Edwardes hastened to his assistance with his raw levies, being the only European amongst them. He might, however, have fared ill had he not been efficiently aided by a portion of Cortlandt's force, with some guns. The victory was complete; and, undoubtedly, much was due to the exertions of Lieutenant Edwardes, who observed in a letter to a friend that "no Englishman could be beaten on the 18th of June." The British force (British only in its leaders) then advanced upon Mooltan, driving the Dewan before them. On the 1st of July, however, another battle took place at Sadoosum, when the enemy was again defeated, and lost four guns. From this date until the 18th of August Edwardes remained before Mooltan, keeping Moolraj a prisoner. The troops under General Whish then arrived, and Lieutenant Edwardes, being of inferior rank to that officer, took only a subordinate part in the subsequent operations. He received the brevet rank of major for his conduct in the affair, and was created an extra member, by special statute, of the Order of the Bath.

He received the honorary degree of D.C.L. at Oxford, in 1850, was re-employed in the civil administration of the Punjab in 1851, and created K.C.B. in 1860 for his services as Commissioner of the Peshawur frontier in the mutiny of 1857. He received the honorary degree of LL.D. at Cambridge in 1860, and was again employed in the Punjab as Commissioner of the Cis-Sutlej States in 1862. He left India on sick leave in 1864, and was created K.C.S.I. in 1866. He married,

in 1850, Emma, daughter of Mr. James Sidney.

SIR E. W. HEAD, D.C.L., F.R.S.

Sir Edmund Head, who died suddenly on the 28th of January, was the only son of the Rev. Sir John Head, Bart., M.A., Perpetual Curate of Egerton, Kent, and Rector of Rayleigh, Essex, by Jane, only child and heir of Thomas Walker, Esq., of London. He was born in 1805, and was educated at Winchester and at Oriel College, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. in 1827, obtaining a first-class in classics. Subsequently he became a Fellow of Merton at the same University, and graduated M.A. in 1830, and in 1834 was appointed University Examiner. He held the civil appointment of one of the Poor Law Commissioners, having previously qualified himself for that office by service as Assistant Commissioner. In October, 1847, he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor for New Brunswick, which office he held until September, 1854, and in that year he was appointed Governor-General of Canada. He retired from that colonial post in 1861.

In 1862, on his return home, he was appointed a Civil Service Commissioner. The lamented baronet was a most accomplished scholar, both in the classical and modern languages, and had received the honorary degree of D.C.L., at Oxford, and LL.D., Cambridge. In literature he was chiefly known by his "Handbook of Spanish Painters;" "but," says a writer in *Notes and Queries*, "whether as a classic scholar and first-class man at Oxford, whether as a writer on art, or as an adept in languages, grammar, etymology, &c., he was indeed most rarely gifted, and truly a 'full man.' The utmost industry, zeal, and employment in study were in him united to intense and close application."

He succeeded his father as eighth baronet, January 4, 1838, and in November of that year he married Anna Maria, daughter of the late Rev. John Yorke, by whom he left surviving issue, two daughters; his only son, John, who was born in 1842, was accidentally drowned in Canada, 1859.

C. J. KEAN, F.S.A., F.R.G.S.

Charles John Kean was the second but only surviving son of the celebrated tragedian, Edmund Kean, and was born in 1811, at Waterford, where his father was then performing. In his fourteenth year he was sent to Eton, where he is said to have made satisfactory progress in his studies. In the spring of 1827 he was summoned to London by his mother, who was in great distress consequent on the

dissipated habits of her husband. Having declined an East India appointment offered to him by the late Mr. Calcraft, M.P., unless he could see an adequate maintenance secured to his mother, whom he found in broken health and separated from her husband, Charles Kean sought an interview with his father to bring matters to a final understanding; but, failing in this, he left Eton in the following July, and accepted an engagement for three years, under Mr. Price, at Drury Lane Theatre, the manager rightly expecting that his name would prove no mean attraction. He made his first appearance on the boards on the 1st of October, 1827, as *Young Norval*, in Home's tragedy of "Douglas," but his success by no means equalled the expectations awakened by the name of the son of Edmund Kean. In 1830 Mr. Charles Kean for the first time visited America, where he was warmly received; but his success in 1833, when, having recrossed the Atlantic, he appeared as *Sir Edward Mortimer* at Covent Garden, was not sufficient to induce him to remain long in London. It was, however, during this engagement that he acted together with his father for the first and last time in the British capital, being the *Jago* to Edmund's *Othello*, at Covent Garden. It was during this performance that Edmund Kean's acting came to an end. Completely broken in health and spirits, his head sank upon his son's shoulder, and he was carried off the stage to the dressing-room. Rallying a little, he was afterwards conveyed to his residence at Richmond, where, in less than a month—namely, on the 15th of May, 1833—he breathed his last. He was buried in Richmond churchyard.

Mr. Charles Kean appeared for the first time at Drury Lane as *Hamlet*, on the 8th of January, 1838. The record now becomes one of uninterrupted triumph. It was during this part of his career, on the 29th of February, 1842, that he married the amiable and accomplished actress, Miss Ellen Tree.

In 1850, in conjunction with Mr. Keeley, he undertook the management of the Princess's Theatre; but it was not till after the dissolution of that partnership that Mr. Kean commenced that gorgeous series of Shakespearian "revivals" which make an epoch in the history of the stage, and which for several years rendered the theatre in Oxford-street, previously obscure, as fashionable as an Italian Opera-house. "Those productions," says the *Times*, "exposed him to much small satire, and it was boldly stated that he rendered Shakspeare attractive by means, not of poetry and acting,

but of scenery and pageant." His marvellous performance of *Louis XI.* in Mr. Dion Boucicault's version of M. Delavigne's play, went far towards silencing his detractors, for it proved that he could draw crowds by the force of unassisted acting. Judicious critics, too, began to reflect that his most sumptuous displays of stage-decoration were not mere empty show, but real practical lessons in archaeology not to be found elsewhere.

A banquet, over which the Duke of Newcastle presided, and at which Mr. Gladstone spoke, in presenting a splendid testimonial from his old Etonian friends, signalized Mr. Kean's retirement from the management of the Princess's in 1859. In the autumn of that year Mr. and Mrs. Kean left London to fulfil a long round of provincial engagements, but returned again in 1861, and shortly afterwards appeared at Drury Lane, their last appearance at that theatre being on the 22nd of May, 1862. In 1863, they commenced their professional tour with a visit to Australia, which was followed by a series of performances through the United States. They came back to London in 1866, and again appeared at the Princess's Theatre. This performance was followed by another provincial engagement, and Mr. Charles Kean's last appearance upon any stage was on the evening of the 28th of May, 1867, at the Prince of Wales Theatre, Liverpool, in his celebrated character of *Louis XI.* On the following day he was seized with a lingering illness, which unhappily terminated in his death, on the 22nd of January.

SIR RICHARD MAYNE, K.C.B.

Sir Richard Mayne, Chief Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, was a son of the Hon. Edward Mayne, who was one of the Judges of the Court of King's Bench in Ireland from 1817 to 1820, and who is said to have been a member of an old Kentish family which migrated into Ireland in the reign of Elizabeth, and established itself in the counties of Fermanagh and Monaghan. He was born in Dublin in 1796, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and afterwards at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took his B.A. degree in 1817, and proceeded M.A. in 1821. He was called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn in the following year, and at one time went the Northern Circuit. He was nominated in 1829 by Sir Robert Peel, then Home Secretary, to the post of Chief Commissioner of Metropolitan Police, on the establishment of that force in lieu of the

antiquated and inefficient parish constables to whom previously the custody of our streets by night was entrusted. Sir Richard was nominated a Companion of the Bath in 1847, in recognition of his official services, and was advanced to the dignity of a K.C.B., civil division, at the time of the Great Exhibition of 1851. Sir Richard Mayne married, in 1831, Georgina, eldest daughter of Mr. Thomas Carvic, of Wyke, Yorkshire, and of Moat Mount, Highwood, Middlesex, by whom he had a family.

DR. MILMAN.

The Very Rev. Henry Hart Milman, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's, an eminent author and divine, who died on the 24th of September, at his residence, Queen's Hill Lodge, Ascot, was the third son of Sir Francis Milman, first Baronet, by his wife, Frances, daughter of William Hart, Esq. He was born in 1791, and was educated at Mr. Denney's school at Greenwich, and at Eton College. From Eton he went to Oxford, where he entered Brasenose College; he, in 1812, won the Newdigate prize for an English poem, and, in 1813, the Chancellor's prize for a Latin poem, in which year he also obtained his degree of B.A., taking a first class in classics. He about this time produced the tragedy of "Fazio," which was acted at Covent Garden, where Miss O'Neill played the part of Bianca, the heroine. It has continued to be a stock play. Dr. Milman was ordained in 1816, and the following year was appointed Vicar of St. Mary's, Reading—a preference which he held for eighteen years. Continuing his literary labours, he successively brought out "Samor," an heroic poem; "The Fall of Jerusalem," "The Martyr of Antioch," "Belshazzar," and "Anne Boleyn"—all dramatic poems. He became, in 1827, Baughton Lecturer; and he was, from 1821, for ten years Professor of Poetry at Oxford. He published a metrical version in English of a Sanscrit poem, entitled "Naba and Damayanta." Then came his most important works—"The History of the Jews," "The History of Christianity, from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire;" and the "History of Latin Christianity to the Pontificate of Nicholas V." He was appointed, in 1835, Rector of St. Margaret's, and Canon of Westminster; and was promoted, in 1849, to the Deanery of St. Paul's. He wrote a *Life of Keats*; and a *Life of Horace*, which is prefixed to the beautiful illustrated edition of that poet published in

1849. He also prepared an edition, with copious notes, of Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."

Dr. Milman married Mary Anne, daughter of Lieutenant-General William Cockell, and had issue four sons. Dean Milman was much and justly beloved both in public and private life. His society had a charm about it that fascinated all within its influence. His knowledge on most subjects was wonderful, and its effect was enhanced by the honest earnestness and thorough amiability of his disposition.

ROSSINI.

Gioacchino Antonio Rossini, the illustrious Italian composer, who died in Paris on the 18th of November, was born in 1792 at Pesaro, where his parents were in poor circumstances, his father belonging to a strolling company of musicians. When about fifteen years of age, Rossini entered the *Lycœum* of Bologna, where he studied counterpoint and composition under Stanislao Mattei—himself a favourite pupil of the famous Padre Martini. The opera which first made him famous was *Tancredi*, brought out during the Carnival of Venice at the Teatro Fenice, in 1813; and this was followed, some months later, by *L'Italiana in Algeri*, at the Teatro San Benedetto, in the same city, and with a success in no degree inferior. By these two works the young composer had shown himself equally a master of *opera seria* and *opera buffa*. His style, too, was now thoroughly matured, and what has ever since been recognized as the school of Rossini—a school which has found more disciples, good, bad, and indifferent, than probably any other in any art—may be said from that moment to have declared itself. The vogue thus obtained by Rossini was, if possible, increased by *Il Turco in Italia*, composed for the Scala, in the autumn of 1814, and at once accepted as a worthy pendant to *L'Italiana in Algeri*. *Il Turco* was followed by *Elisabetta Regina d'Inghilterra* (Naples, 1815), which had an enormous success, and is especially remembered as the opera in which Rossini first set the example of writing his own ornaments and "floriture," which previously, in accordance with long custom, used to be either prepared or extemporized by the singers themselves. The San Carlo, where it was produced, was at that time considered the first lyric theatre of Italy. *Elisabetta* was followed by *Torvaldo e Doriiska* (Rome, 1815), an *opera seria*, which failed, and *Torvaldo e Doriiska* by *Il Barbiere di Siviglia* (Rome, 1816—at the Teatro di

Torre Argentina), an *opera buffa*, which was hopelessly condemned on the first night, but now, more than half a century later, is perhaps the most popular of all operas except Mozart's *Don Giovanni*. *Il Barbiere* was successively followed by *Otello* (1816—Teatro del Fondo, Naples), *Cenerentola* (1817—Rome), and *La Gasse Ladra* (1817—the Scala, Milan). Happily each of these works, which materially increased their author's fame, endures and is likely to endure. To these succeeded several others, amongst which was *Semiramide*, which is popular to this day, and the last of Rossini's purely Italian operas (his last, indeed, composed for Italy) was first played at the Fenice, in Venice, February 23, 1823, with any thing but the success that has universally attended it since.

After going to Vienna, and—much to the chagrin of Beethoven, who was nothing if not German—turning the heads of the fickle Viennese, Rossini visited London. The great Italian, who sang and played just as well as he composed, and was not less prepossessing as a man than gifted as a musician, was every where welcomed and fêted in the English capital. He then commenced his career as director of the Opéra Italien in Paris, where, after much opposition, both interested and disinterested, his music acquired extraordinary popularity. There, on the 3rd of August, 1829, he crowned the edifice of his glory with his immortal masterpiece, *Guillaume Tell*. It is unnecessary to say one word about the universally popular *Stabat Mater*, a masterpiece in another style.

In 1847 Rossini moved to Florence, and in 1855, his health being much impaired, by the advice of his doctor, quitted Florence for Paris, which he never afterwards left, dwelling during the summer in a villa he had built for himself at Passy, and during the winter in apartments in the Rue de la Chaussée d'Antin. At Paris, where, after a time, his health was completely restored, he was the object of attention and solicitude from high and low, for he was sought out and courted, not merely on account of his fame as a composer, but for his wit, his humour, his amiability, and general goodness. With him departed one of the most remarkable geniuses and one of the kindest spirits of the nineteenth century.

MR. JUSTICE SHEE.

The Hon. Sir William Shee, one of the Justices of the Court of Queen's Bench, a distinguished lawyer, advocate, and Judge, who died on the 19th of February, was the

son of Joseph Shee, Esq., of Thomastown, in the county of Kilkenny. He was born at Finchley, Middlesex, in 1804; and was educated at the Roman Catholic foundation, St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, near Durham, and at the University of Edinburgh. He was called to the English Bar by the Hon. Society of Lincoln's Inn, June 19, 1828. He soon after his call politically distinguished himself by an eloquent speech on the Liberal side at the great Protestant meeting of "the Men of Kent," held on Pennenden-heath, November 24, 1828. He went the Home Circuit, and rose quickly into business and repute. His practice eventually so increased that it became at times very great indeed. He was made Serjeant-at-law in 1840, obtained a Patent of Precedence in 1846, and was appointed a Queen's Serjeant in 1857. He was, in 1847, an unsuccessful candidate at the general election for the borough of Marylebone; he, in 1852, was elected M.P. for the county of Kilkenny, and represented that county in Parliament till 1857. He subsequently unsuccessfully addressed the constituencies of the county of Kilkenny and of Marylebone. He was a moderate and consistent Liberal in politics; but he was of a high and independent spirit, which did not readily yield to the varying requirements of Parliamentary electors, and thus he did not always suit them. This elevated tone, however, combined with great talent and good sense, unbending honesty of purpose, a most amiable and benevolent disposition, and very genial manners, had made him so popular among all members of the law, that it was with the acclamation of the whole Bar, and of the profession generally, that he was at last raised to judicial rank in 1864, as a Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench. He was the first Roman Catholic Judge of the Superior Courts of Westminster since the Revolution, the last Catholic Judge before him having been Sir Richard Alibone, a Justice of the Court of King's Bench, who died in the summer of 1688. Mr. Justice Shee was knighted in 1864. His manly bearing and untiring energy, his sound knowledge, and his other excellent qualities were making him also conspicuous on the Bench, when, in the midst of apparent health, a sudden illness carried him off.

LORD WENSLEYDALE.

The Right Hon. Sir James Parke, P.C., Baron Wensleydale, who died on the 25th of February at his seat, Amptill Park, Bedfordshire, was the son of Thomas Parke, Esq., of Highfield House, near

Liverpool, by his wife, Ann, daughter of William Preston, Esq. He was born March 22, 1782, and was educated at Macclesfield Grammar School, and at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1799, at the age of seventeen, he obtained one of the highest distinctions in Cambridge—the Craven University Scholarship; in 1800 he was elected scholar of Trinity; he 1802 he obtained Sir William Browne's medal for his Alcaic ode, "Pompeii Columna;" and in 1803 he graduated as fifth Wrangler and senior Chancellor's (classical) medallist. He was elected Fellow of Trinity in 1804, and proceeded M.A. in 1806, and LL.D. in 1835. Having chosen the law as his profession, he, after serving his terms at the Temple, practised for many years, with great success, as a special pleader, and his intimate acquaintance with and relish for the technicalities of the science of pleading characterized his whole after-career at the Bar and on the Bench. He was called to the Bar by the Hon. Society of the Inner Temple in 1813. He went the Northern Circuit, and soon obtained there and at Westminster a good substantial practice, establishing for himself the reputation of being one of the soundest common-lawyers of his day. He was, in 1828, raised to judicial rank as a Justice of the Court of King's Bench, and, in 1834, he was transferred to the Exchequer as a Baron of that court. He was knighted in 1828.

Sir James Parke, as a Judge, was distinguished for his vigorous intellect and his skill in comprehending facts and applying the law to them. He was, it is true, a great special pleader; but he was more: he was not only an adept in mere legal preciseness, but he showed a powerful and master mind in dealing with all the bearings of the cases before him. Many were the instances of this; one memorable one may be cited, viz. the trial of John Tawell for the murder of Sarah Hart, at Slough, in the spring of 1845, when the learned Baron, who presided, was universally held to have earned high honour for his closely argumentative and exhaustive summing up, which completely baffled the vast ingenuity and splendid eloquence of Sir Fitzroy Kelly in Tawell's behalf. Tawell himself is said to have called his Lordship "a just, but severe judge." Sir James Parke retired from the Bench in 1856, and on January 16 of that year he was created Baron Wensleydale, of Walton, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, "for the term of his natural life." This startling innovation of a life peerage, though not unprecedented, caused a great sensation. Lord Derby and Lord

Lyndhurst took the matter up in the House of Lords, and it was referred to a Committee of Privileges which brought in a report unfavourable to the Baron's taking his seat as a life peer. He nevertheless retained his title; but to secure him a seat in the House of Lords he obtained another patent, dated July 23, 1856, creating him Baron Wensleydale, of Walton, in the county palatine of Lancaster, with the usual remainder to the heirs male of his body. His Lordship as a law lord fully sustained in the House his great previous reputation.

Lord Wensleydale married, in 1817, Cecilia Arabella Frances, youngest daughter of Samuel Francis Barlow, Esq., of Middlethorpe, in the county of York, by whom he had issue three sons, all of whom died in infancy, and three daughters; so that, having left no male issue, all his honours became extinct with him.

Mr. Baron Martin, in court, thus

gracefully alluded to the deceased Lord Wensleydale: "Having," said the Baron, "sat for some years with that learned Judge, and having practised before him for a much longer period, I think it is but becoming in me to state that, in my opinion, the country has lost by his death one of the most learned lawyers and one of the ablest Judges who ever sat in Westminster Hall. No one who has not had the advantage of sitting with him on the Bench can thoroughly appreciate the qualities of his great mind, or his earnest wish at all times to do his duty. He never allowed any thing to interfere with the conscientious discharge of those duties which he imposed upon himself, or felt belonged to him in connexion with his position as a Judge. He was, without doubt, the ablest and best public servant I was personally acquainted with in the whole course of my life."

REMARKABLE TRIALS.

I.

THE FENIAN TRIALS.

On the 20th of April the six prisoners charged with murder in connexion with the gunpowder explosion at the Clerkenwell House of Detention in December last, were put upon their trial at a special Session of the Central Criminal Court, before Lord Chief Justice Cockburn and Mr. Baron Bramwell. Their names were William Desmond, Timothy Desmond, Nicholas English, John O'Keefe, Michael Barrett, and Ann Justice. As had been anticipated, the pressure for admission to the Court-house, the area of which is exceedingly limited, was very great. The Under-Sheriffs, however, had done their best to apportion the room at their disposal; and the Judges having assumed the seats assigned them, the prisoners were put forward, and formally told by the Clerk of Arraignment that they stood indicted for the murder of Sarah Ann Hodgkinson, feloniously, wilfully, and of their malice aforethought, on the 13th of December last, in the parish of St. James's, Clerkenwell, within the jurisdiction of that Court. They severally pleaded "Not Guilty."

The Attorney-General (Sir J. B. Karslake) and Solicitor-General (Sir Balil Brett), with whom were Mr. Hardinge Giffard, Q.C., Mr. Poland, and Mr. Archibald, appeared to conduct the prosecution on the part of the Crown; Mr. Montagu Williams and Mr. Edward Clarke were counsel for the prisoners Ann Justice and John O'Keefe; Mr. Warner Sleight for William Desmond; Mr. Straight for Timothy Desmond; Mr. Keogh for Nicholas English; and Mr. J. B. Greene for the prisoner Barrett.

On the application of Mr. Montagu Williams, who had been but recently instructed, it was agreed, with the assent of the Counsel for the Crown, that the evidence, so far as it might affect the prisoner Ann Justice, whom he represented, should be postponed as far as possible, to enable him to conduct her defence satisfactorily.

The Attorney-General in opening the case said, On the 20th of November, 1867, a man named Richard Burke was arrested near Woburn-square, together with a man named Casey. They were conveyed before a magistrate and remanded—Burke on a charge of treason-felony, and Casey on a charge of assaulting a constable. They were brought up again on the 30th, remanded until the 7th of December, and again remanded until the 14th of December. At no very long period after the arrest of Burke, who was believed to be deeply

interested in the Fenian conspiracy, arrangements were made by members of the Fenian Brotherhood for the purpose of rescuing him. The first plan was to effect his rescue as he was going to Bow-street in the prison van. About a week or ten days after Burke's arrest two men came to town—Barrett, who passed by the name of Jackson, and Murphy, known as Captain Murphy; who also passed by the name of Hastings. Barrett frequented the house, 8, Pulteney-court, Golden-square, at which place a man not in custody, named Felix Fallon, was lodging. Barrett lodged there for some time with Fallon. Very shortly after the arrival of Barrett and Murphy they entered into communication with a man named Mullany, a tailor, living at 20, Sherwood-street, Golden-square. At that time Mullany was also in communication with English and William Desmond, two of the prisoners, and he believed also with the other Desmond (Timothy). It seemed that the original plan of liberating Burke by an attack upon the prison van was given up, and that the scheme for blowing up the prison wall was laid by Burke himself. From the facts that had come to the knowledge of the prosecution, it would appear that on the 11th of December, at a meeting that took place at the house of William Desmond, it was arranged that the prison wall should be blown down on the 12th of December, and it was also arranged that a signal should be given to Burke that the deed was about to be done by throwing a ball over the prison wall. At this meeting it appeared that several of the parties were armed with pistols, and that one of the men who were present was severely injured by a pistol going off accidentally. On the 12th of December a truck containing a barrel which there was no doubt was filled with gunpowder, was wheeled close to the prison wall, and three of the prisoners were present and assisted to convey the barrel to the spot. A ball was thrown over the prison wall, and it appeared that an attempt was actually made to blow up the wall, and a light was placed on the barrel, but for some reason or other it did not explode, and the barrel was taken away. On the same evening another meeting of the conspirators took place, and he should show that Barrett was very angry at the failure of the plot, and said he would go himself on the following day and blow the place to hell. A person named Murphy, who was known as Captain Murphy, appeared to have also taken an active part in the proceedings, and he was stated to have given the prisoners money on the day when the attempt was made to blow up the prison wall; but he had made his escape. Shortly before the explosion took place the prisoner Ann Justice went to the prison, and represented herself to be the aunt of the prisoner Casey, and this was no doubt with the object of obtaining some information that was likely to be useful to the conspirators. The case against her would principally rest upon this fact, and that she was in communication with the Desmonds, and was actually present at the time when the explosion took place. It appeared that several attempts were made to ignite the gunpowder, and that two or three of the first fires or squibs that were made use of went out, and that at length the prisoner Barrett placed a squib in the barrel, and the explosion took place which caused the terrible havoc and destruction of life with which they were acquainted. A very much larger loss of life would undoubtedly have been occasioned, but, from some information that was received by the authorities, the prisoners were not exercised at the usual time, but in the morning; and at the time the explosion actually took place, they were all locked up within cells. It would appear, however, that the prisoners were not aware of this, for the signal agreed upon—namely, the throwing of the ball—took place, and they no doubt anticipated that their scheme would be successful. The prisoner Barrett seemed to have shaved

off his whiakers immediately after the occurrence, and he believed that in the result there would be no doubt whatever that he was the person who fired the barrel of gunpowder.

The approver Patrick Mullany was the first witness. He narrated how he had been sworn a Fenian on the recommendation of the prisoner English; and spoke of a plan they had to get men into the Volunteer force, as a means of obtaining arms. Describing the progress of the conspiracy to release Burke, he said, I frequently saw Barrett, and our conversation was chiefly about Burke, and what was best to be done to get him out of custody, but nothing was done for a time, and until a letter was received from some party. After the letter had been received I was asked to purchase some green copperas, which was used to bring out some invisible ink, and the letter was then read by Captain Murphy. The writing was invisible until the copperas was used to it. This letter was afterwards shown to William Desmond in my house. It contained a drawing of a house which was intended to represent the House of Detention. I saw Captain Murphy on the morning the explosion took place, but I have never seen him since. The letter stated that a sewer ran under a part of the wall, which was very weak at the place, and that a barrel of gunpowder must be obtained, and it would blow the wall to hell. It also stated that it must be done about four o'clock, and they must get the money to buy the powder a little at a time; and if they did not do what was required, they ought to be shot. This letter was supposed to have come from Burke, and besides the words there were also marks to indicate where the sewer was, and also the weak part of the wall.

Mullany went on to say that he contributed half a sovereign towards the purchase of the gunpowder; but this was afterwards returned to him by "Captain Murphy." This was at the period of the tailors' strike, and he was out of work. He said, Besides the letter I have referred to, other letters addressed to Murphy were brought to my house by the postman, and I have seen stuff rubbed over the paper and the writing came out. I remember the Wednesday before the explosion, the 11th of December. We had a meeting about half-past ten on the night of that day. English, Barrett, William Desmond, M'Carthy, the man who carried the powder, Captain Murphy, and about a dozen altogether were present at this meeting, and some of them had firearms, and a revolver which Barrett had went off by accident, and wounded a man named Ryan. Murphy then loaded a cavalry pistol, and gave it to one of the men present; and it was arranged that they should meet on the following day for the purpose of going to the House of Detention and rescuing Burke, and they were to go by twos and threes to the prison, and they were all to be there by half-past three o'clock. Burke had been made aware before this of what was intended to be done. I did not go to the House of Detention according to the arrangement, but remained at home; and on the evening of the 12th of December, which was the day in question, I saw Barrett at Kavanagh's public-house, and we walked part of the way home together. As we were going along I asked him how they had got on with the barrel, and he said that the captain had failed in lighting the fuse on that day, but that on the following day he would light it himself, and blow the place to hell. I inquired where the barrel was, and he said he would show me if I went with him; but I did not do so.

The witness then narrated that he heard of the explosion on the same night that it occurred, about five o'clock; and during the evening a man named Patten, who had attended some of the meetings, came to his house, and he

observed that his ear was bleeding, and he told him how it happened. The same night he saw the prisoner Barrett at the Welsh Stores public-house, Glasshouse-street, and his whiskers had been cut off. The witness said he spoke to Barrett, and Barrett told him not to speak so loud, for it was he who had fired the barrel. He did not see Barrett any more after that until he was in custody at Bow-street. He also saw nothing of Captain Murphy.

A warder at the House of Detention, named Clifford, described seeing three men on the day before the explosion, drawing a truck with a barrel on it. These men, he said at first, were Timothy Desmond and William Desmond; but corrected himself, saying that the second man was English. The third was Allen, whom the magistrates had discharged. Finally he said he would not swear to them. Another warder, after some objection raised but overruled, gave evidence of Burke's behaviour in the prison-yard on the day before the explosion. He said that Burke fell out and leaned against the outer wall at the farthest point from where the wall was blown down the following day. He took off his side-spring boot very slowly, wiped his foot and stocking with his hand, looking at the same time at the houses in Corporation-lane. He then put his boot on again, and fell into the rank with the other prisoners. Next day witness saw the effects of the explosion. There were no bricks within five or six yards of the spot where Burke stood when he fell out.

Various witnesses described the circumstances of the explosion. It appeared that Timothy Desmond was partly intoxicated when arrested after the outrage. Henry Bird, a dairyman, who was delivering milk in Corporation-lane at the time, positively identified Barrett as the man who applied the fuse to the barrel. He had, however, at one time said O'Neill was the man. Two of the little boys who were near the spot identified Barrett; a third could not speak to any of the prisoners. A warder spoke of finding in the toe of a stocking brought to Burke by a woman named Barry, who frequently visited him, four or five "pieces of green mineral." These the warder kept. Dr. Odling, Professor of Chemistry at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, was then called. He deposed that the substance in the glass bulb was chloride of gold, with which invisible writing could be done, while the "green minerals" were copperas, a solution of which would make such writing legible. He believed the explosion was not effected by petroleum, but with gunpowder in a barrel which had contained petroleum. Evidence was then given by Morris, an apprentice of Mullany, the informer, showing that Barrett, under the name of Jackson, Captain Murphy, under the name of Hastings (this man got clear away), English, and Mrs. Barry, were continually at Mullany's, in Sherwood-street, before the explosion. Jane Koeppel, a woman who worked for Mullany (who was a tailor), spoke to these, and to W. Desmond, and to Burke himself, as having frequented Mullany's.

The case for the prosecution being closed, the Lord Chief Justice having intimated some doubt whether there was any case against the prisoner Anne Justice, the Attorney-General said that the case against her was what he had stated in his opening address, and nothing more. She had been to the prison on the day of the explosion to take Casey's dinner, and when she came out she remained for a considerable time in company with Timothy Desmond.

The Lord Chief Justice said she had not been seen at the prison prior to that day, which, it must not be forgotten, was the second attempt to blow up the prison. It had not been shown that she had ever been in communication with any one of the parties mixed up with these transactions. If she had been a

party to the deed, she must have been aware that the hour of exercising the prisoners had been changed. She might have remained about the place from curiosity, but, except that she had been seen speaking to William Desmond and Allen, and that she was loitering about the place, there was nothing to show any complicity on her part. His learned brother quite agreed with him in the opinion that there was no evidence against Ann Justice to go to the jury.

A verdict of "Not guilty" was then taken against Ann Justice, and she was discharged from the dock.

The female prisoner quickly rose, and turning to Barrett, who sat next her in the dock, she kissed him. She then shook hands warmly with each of the prisoners and left the dock.

Mr. W. Sleight then addressed the jury for the prisoner William Desmond. He maintained that the Attorney-General had failed to prove the allegations of his opening address, so far as his client was concerned. He examined the evidence of Mullany, who for three or four years had passed himself off as a Fenian when he was not a member of the Fenian brotherhood. It was Mullany who plotted the explosion at Clerkenwell. He was the prime mover with Burke, whose letter was sent to him. Mullany got the room, arranged where the meetings were to be held, and then, when he found himself in danger, he tried to buy his life at the sacrifice of the lives of the prisoners in the dock. Mullany was the one and principal witness against William Desmond. Upon his own statement Mullany was a perjurer, and unless his evidence was corroborated in every material particular it was worth nothing. There was good reason to believe that the person known as Hastings, but who was Captain Murphy, had been taken by several of the witnesses for his client. Murphy had been described as rather stout, and as wearing a brown beard, slightly turning to grey, and was just the sort of man who might be confused in the minds of the witnesses with William Desmond.

The Attorney-General said he had gone through the evidence which affected the prisoner O'Keefe, and although he believed that the evidence relating to his identification was *bonâ fide*, yet he felt that it was not such as he ought to rely upon in asking the jury to convict him.

The Lord Chief Justice said he quite agreed with the Attorney-General as to the *bonâ fides* of the evidence relating to the identification of O'Keefe, but he also agreed with him that the evidence as to his identity and complicity was much too weak to enable a conviction to be safely founded upon it. He would therefore, with the concurrence of the jury, call upon them to pronounce a verdict of "Not guilty" against O'Keefe.

Mr. Baron Bramwell said he quite concurred in the course proposed to be taken.

The jury having also expressed the fullest concurrence, a verdict of "Not guilty" was returned against O'Keefe, who was removed from the dock.

Mr. Straight next addressed the jury on behalf of Timothy Desmond. He reminded the jury that Vaughan was the only witness who deposed to any thing against Timothy Desmond. Some stress had been laid upon the fact that he had been seen on the afternoon of the explosion, standing on the opposite side of the prison from where the explosion took place. Ann Justice had been discharged, and if she were innocently there, why should not Timothy Desmond be innocently there also? There was nothing whatever to show that Timothy Desmond was a conspirator, or that he was even cognizant of what was taking place in Corporation-lane. He was on that day merely a drunken man, wandering about in

a purposeless manner. He was seen running away after the explosion, but the panic produced by it was sufficient to account for any one's running away.

On behalf of Nicholas English, Mr. Keogh, after eulogizing the fair and impartial statement with which the Attorney-General had opened the case against the prisoners, which would show the world that, whatever panic might have existed in the public mind after the explosion, the first law officer of the Crown would not use a single word to disturb the minds or inflame the passions of his hearers, dwelt upon the weakness of the case against English. No one had spoken with any certainty as to his identification. On the day of the explosion English was not present upon the scene. Of the great number of witnesses called by the Crown not one swore to or even mentioned the name of English. There was not one of the witnesses who saw him on the day of the explosion. Of one thing the jury might be positive—that whoever ignited the barrel of gunpowder, it was not English.

Mr. J. B. Greene then addressed the jury for Michael Barrett. He chiefly concerned himself with the evidence of Mullany. He dwelt upon the discrepancies between the different accounts of the witnesses of Barrett's personal appearance and the contradictory evidence as to his having been the man who lighted the barrel. He was not aware of any reliable evidence establishing the identity of the prisoner Barrett with the man Jackson of whom Mullany spoke. There was no evidence of Barrett having been connected with Fenianism, and he asked for a fair acquittal of him. Barrett was a stevedore, and had lived in Glasgow for a couple of years; and he (Mr. Greene) would satisfy the jury that he was not only not present at the explosion, but not in London, nor in England. He would satisfy them that for months he had not quitted Scotland, and that he never left Glasgow until after he was arrested in the company of O'Neill. Being an Irishman he entertained warm sympathies with what might be called rather ultra-Irish opinions. In Glasgow, as in London and in various parts of Ireland, the execution of the three men in Manchester in November last gave rise to a great deal of popular excitement. A few days before their execution there was a torch-light meeting at Glasgow, at which Barrett was present, and he remained in Glasgow up to and after the explosion. About the 10th or 11th of December arrangements were being made there for a procession in honour of the three men who had been executed, but on the 12th of December, the day before it was to have taken place, a message was received from the Roman Catholic Bishop of Glasgow (Dr. Gray), to the effect that he disapproved of the proposed demonstration, and that if the managing committee would refrain from making it he was willing that a solemn requiem and high mass should be held in memory of the executed men. In consequence of that a meeting was held on the evening of the 13th of December, at the Bell Hotel, Glasgow, Mr. M'Corrie, the editor of an evening newspaper there, occupying the chair. The meeting broke up between eleven and twelve o'clock, and witnesses would prove that Barrett was there and that they spoke to him there. Some of them went into a private room and had tea after the meeting, among whom was Barrett, who remained until after midnight, and Mr. M'Corrie, who was a musical man, played the piano. He would be called as a witness, and two others would corroborate him. An *alibi* would also be proved by an entirely different set of witnesses, who had not the slightest object or motive for deception, and who would satisfy the jury that Barrett was seen in Glasgow on the 12th, 13th, and 14th of December. The evidence in that case would go to show that on Thursday, the 12th of December, Barrett, accompanied by a man named

Mullen, left a pair of shoes to be soled with a shoemaker in Glasgow named M'Nulty, who promised to do them by the following day; that on calling for them next day and finding they had not been touched he became angry, and still more so on Saturday, the 14th, when he called again and found them still undone. During the altercation two workmen in the same trade, and acquaintances of his, called at M'Nulty's, and each taking a shoe sat down there and then and soled it, Barrett sitting by while they did so, and actually reading to them an account of the Clerkenwell explosion, which appeared in a Glasgow evening paper of that day, in order to pass the time.

Michael M'Nulty was then called and examined by Mr. Greene. He said he was a boot and shoe maker carrying on business at his own house in Glasgow. He knew Barrett. Had seen him three times at his own house. Saw him for the first time on Thursday evening, December 12. He came to witness's house with a man named Mullen, whom he knew personally. Mullen introduced Barrett, and asked him if he would sole, heel, and welt a pair of boots for Barrett. He said he would, and promised to have them ready on the next evening. On the next evening, the evening of the explosion at Clerkenwell, Barrett came, but he had not touched the boots at all. Witness said he had been in too big a hurry with his own work. He asked when they would be done, and witness promised to have them ready next day. He returned next day (Saturday) about five o'clock. The boots had not then been begun. He called witness any thing but a gentleman, and if it had not been on account of Mr. Mullen he said he would have put him and the boots out together, if he had been able. He cooled down a little bit, and two acquaintances of witness's, both shoemakers, came in. Witness asked one of them if he would be so kind as to do a favour for him that afternoon. He asked what it was, and witness said it was to sole, heel, and welt a pair of boots. He asked what time witness wanted the boots done, and he replied between six and seven. He said he could not do the boots in that time, and the other said he would do one boot, and the other man should do the other. They both sat down to do them, and they got them done between six and seven o'clock. Barrett sent out for an evening paper while the boots were doing. There were two windows, and three of them worked at one window while Barrett sat at the other and read the paper. He read the account of the explosion in London, of which witness had heard in the morning. Barrett remained until the boots were finished. Mr. Mullen, who introduced him, had since gone to America. Barrett had from three to four days' beard upon him when he called upon him on the 12th, 13th, and 14th of December. Witness had not seen Barrett again until the preceding evening, when he saw him in gaol. Captain M'Call came to witness to ask if he knew a man named O'Neil or Barrett, who was called Jackson. A man named M'Manus called and showed witness a letter.

Cross-examined by the Attorney-General.—I live in Bridgegate-street, Glasgow, a short way up the Green. I have not a shop, but work at my own house. I work for the shops, and if any one brings me a job, I do it. I work for Mr. Johnson and Mr. David Mahon; those are the only shops I work for. There is no name on my door. Mullen was a shoemaker, who worked for Mr. Neison. I have lived in Glasgow for fifteen or sixteen years. I have not the slightest notion where Mr. Neison lives, or where he lived at the time Mullen called upon me. I had known Mullen twelve months as a shoemaker. Ten months ago Mr. Neison's shop was at the bottom of the South Wynd.

Mullen worked on his master's place, and he could not do the job of mending Barrett's boots without their going through his master's hands. He worked at making pegged boots. I last saw Mullen about the beginning of January at a *soirée* and ball in Glasgow. That was not a Fenian *soirée* or ball. It was held about the 2nd or 3rd of January. Mullen was a married man and had a wife and family at a house of his own at Canonrig-street. I have never seen Mullen since that night of the ball. My wife and little boy were present in the house, but there was no one else but Mullen and Barrett in the room on the 12th. Next day Barrett came alone, and the following day also. There was no one in the room on those two days but my little boy, who came running in and out. On the third day there was no one at all in the room when Barrett came. The *soirée* and ball were at the Bell Hotel, Trongate, Glasgow. Barrett had been in my house on the 14th ten or fifteen minutes before the two men came in. He said I was not a man worth much, and I said I was worth as much as he. I said that if it had not been on account of Mr. Mullen I would put him and the boots out together if I was able. After we had been talking in this way for ten minutes or a quarter of an hour with the boots lying on the floor the two other shoemakers came in. Barrett came about five minutes to three, and it was about ten minutes or a quarter past three when the men came. He sat there till between six and seven smoking and reading the paper. The only part of the paper he read out aloud was about the explosion. I cannot say whether he read the other parts of the paper or not. It cost 4s. 6d. to sole the boots, and Mullen paid me the same night in a public-house. It is in the street I live in, but I do not know the name of it. John Pake and a man named Welsh were the men who were in the room with us. My wife may have come in with a light for my pipe, but not to stop. I did not give Mullen any receipt. I heard to my sorrow that Mullen had gone to America, for I was bail for him for 5*l.* in a loan office. Captain M'Call called upon me on the Sunday after Barrett and O'Neill were taken. I knew O'Neill, but did not know where he lived—somewhere on the far side of the water, across the bridge; I had known O'Neill six or seven months. Three or four days after Captain M'Call called upon me. Mr. M'Manus came to see me and brought a letter. When Captain M'Call came to my house I did not tell him that I had never repaired any boots for Barrett, nor did I say that I did not remember any man coming to my house about that time to get boots bottomed. He asked me if I remembered any man coming and kicking up a row about boots not being "buttoned." I did not understand him at all, because I could not button any boots. I could have sewed on buttons, but I could not button boots. He mentioned the name of Barrett or else Jackson several times when he spoke to me about the boots. I said I did not know either Barrett or Jackson. I told Captain M'Call that no man came to me and kicked up a row about his boots not being "buttoned." I told him that no man was sent out for a newspaper, and that no one read the account of the Clerkenwell outrage. I told him that O'Neill had brought in a paper on the morning of the 14th, containing an account of the Clerkenwell outrage. I did not tell Captain M'Call that there was no man who came to kick up a row with me because his boots were not ready. I did not tell Captain M'Call that no man had come to me with work. I did not say "work," I said I had never "buttoned" boots since I had been in the house. I did not say I had not bottomed boots for some one. It was three or four days after Captain M'Call called that I saw M'Manus. He

asked me whether I remembered bottoming or repairing a pair of boots. I said I did not remember at the time. After I had said that he read me a letter, which told him to go to a man named James Mullen.

The letter was then put in and read. It was from the prisoner Michael Barrett to a friend at Glasgow, and was dated Millbank Prison, London. The writer said he was grieved to say that a series of reverses had befallen him lately, of the cause of which he was ignorant. He had fallen into the meshes of the law, and once in them it was not easy to be extricated. He wished the person to whom the letter was addressed to go to a man named M'Nulty to see if he remembered doing a little work for him. If he did not his friend was to mention a few particulars which would bring the circumstance to his recollection—namely, that he (Barrett) waited upon him on three occasions—on the 12th of December, when he went to him with Mullen and asked him to repair some boots, and on the 13th, when they were not ready, but when he promised to have them ready on the following day. On his going again on the 14th they had a row because the boots were not ready, and M'Nulty had to get two men to repair them. During the time they were at work he (Barrett) read the account of the Clerkenwell explosion to the men, which was the first they had heard of it. This, the writer went on to say, should bring the matter to M'Nulty's recollection. He was also to find out the two men who had helped to repair his boots. The letter, which was signed "Michael Barrett," contained a postscript requesting that his red Crimean shirt and other articles of clothing left at his lodgings at Glasgow should be forwarded to him, and added, "We are in a miserable condition, being without a friend or acquaintance to do any thing for us;" and it concluded with saying, "Write at once; all our letters are read by the governor of the gaol."

The Attorney-General.—After having seen M'Manus when he read that letter to you, did you see Captain M'Call again?

Witness.—I did not go to Captain M'Call and tell him any thing about it.

The Attorney-General.—I ask you again whether, before M'Manus came to you with that letter, Captain M'Call had not expressly asked you whether you had repaired any boots for Barrett, whether you did not say, "I have not, nor do I remember any man coming to my house to get his boots bottomed, or kicking up a row because they were not done, or getting men to assist in doing them, or sending out for a newspaper to read while they did them"?

Witness.—Captain M'Call came to me, but he did not mention any thing about my getting any one's boots "bottomed." He put me completely astray by talking of some one's boots being "buttoned." Nothing else occurred. O'Neill came to my house on Saturday morning, December 14, and brought a newspaper to my work-room. It contained the news of the explosion, but I did not read it, and my little boy took it away. I did not go to Captain M'Call after seeing M'Manus. I said I would find the two men who did Barrett's boots. I left Glasgow to come to town on the night of the 16th. There were seven of us who came up. Myself, the two shoemakers, and M'Manus were shown Barrett in gaol yesterday evening. When he came to my house he had a hat on and dark clothes. I did not notice him much, for I did not like his way of talking to me. He wears now the jacket he then had on. He had no beard or hair then, except three or four days' growth. I did not assist in getting up the subscription for the Manchester men.

Re-examined.—The other prisoners were with Barrett when I saw him in gaol

yesterday. They were all walked round, and I picked him out as the man who had been at my shop. Captain M'Call is the superintendent of the Glasgow police. When he called upon me he was accompanied by a detective named Smith. I am quite sure he did not ask me about "bottoming," but about "buttoning" boots. The reason I did not finish Barrett's boots was that I was obliged to finish a pair for the shop for which I worked.

By the Lord Chief Justice.—I cannot say how long it took Barrett to read the account of the Clerkenwell outrage to me and the men in my room—not very long. I have no clock, but I should not think it took more than five minutes. I do not know which of the Glasgow papers it was in. There are two published every day. It did not contain an account of any thing that had passed at the police-court in London—only the blowing up of the prison wall. It was just an account of the explosion. When Mullen introduced Barrett to me he did not tell me where he lived, and I did not ask. I do not know how it was that Barrett did not pay for his boots himself. He took the boots away with him, and I was content to look to Mullen for the money. He gave me no receipt.

By Mr. Baron Bramwell.—The boots I took home to the shop on Saturday night were one pair of men's boots. The shop I took them to was Mr. D. Mahon's. He gave me out that work on the 13th. I had only one day to do them in, and that was the reason why I could not repair Barrett's boots. I should have got no money that week unless I had finished Mr. Mahon's boots. I also had a pair to take home on the night of the 13th. The men who came to my house and who did Barrett's boots were journeymen shoemakers who had got their week's work finished. I cannot tell which of them mended the right boot and which the left. I believe that these men had not heard of the explosion, except that they might have seen it on the newspaper placards. I said it was a horrid event, and the other men said about the same. Barrett said it was the most ridiculous thing he ever read. I suppose he meant that it was a very wild job. All seemed to be quite "taken down" about it.

John Peak and John Welsh, the two shoemakers who, according to M'Nulty's story, mended Barrett's boots, were called, and repeated the story in all particulars. Nor were they shaken by cross-examination in any perceptible degree, except upon points of detail. There was then called another set of witnesses to support the *alibi*. The first of these was Arthur Burgoyne, a young man about Barrett's age. He said, I recognize Michael Barrett among the prisoners in the dock. I knew him first last August, at Glasgow. I generally met him once a week after that. I remember the executions at Manchester for the murder of Brett. There was a torchlight demonstration on the Thursday before the execution, which occurred on the Saturday. A Mr. M'Corrie was the chairman, and Michael Barrett was at it. I carried a torch. After the demonstration was over, I heard Barrett say that a person had run a torch against his jaw. He said his face was almost destroyed by it. When I knew him first he had a light, small, thin whisker, and this was his state at the demonstration. After the demonstration he had no whiskers. His whiskers appeared to have been singed. Cross-examined by the Attorney-General, he said he was not a Fenian. He could be a sympathizer with the men who were executed at Manchester without being a Fenian. He might have called them the murdered men, but did not remember having done so. Another witness, Charles M'Manus, was next called. On the Testament being placed in his hand and the oath administered, he raised the book reverentially above his head at arm's length before kissing it. In

reply to Mr. Greene, he said he saw Barrett at the meeting to arrange a funeral demonstration. He had neither whiskers nor beard then, and had apparently not been shaved for three or four days. The date of that meeting was "about the 13th of December." The cross-examination was directed to show that the witness sympathized with the Fenians. Mr. Peter M'Corrie was next called. He described himself as editor and proprietor of the *Irish Catholic Banner*, published at Glasgow. He also swore that Barrett was at the torchlight procession. The Attorney-General now adduced evidence to rebut the *alibi*. He called Mr. Alexander M'Call, superintendent of the Glasgow police, who said he received a copy of the letter written by Barrett from prison, in which he had asked a friend to seek out the shoemaker M'Nulty, and bring the facts sworn to in the *alibi* to his recollection. Mr. M'Call said, "I found out the man M'Nulty. I asked him some questions. He said, I never heard Barrett's name, nor do I know him at all. He never was introduced to me by O'Neill. I never repaired any boots for O'Neill. I do not remember any man coming to my house about that time to get boots buttoned." I asked him if he had any recollection of any man coming to his house to get a pair of boots "buttoned," and if he did not remember a man coming back there about that, and, the work not being done, his kicking up a row. He said he had no recollection of such a thing. I asked if he remembered a man who had left some work with him sending out for a newspaper and reading about the Clerkenwell affair. He said he did not, and that such a thing could not have taken place without his remembering it. I told M'Nulty I was chief superintendent of police when I asked him those questions.

M'Nulty was recalled at the instance of the Attorney-General, and in answer to questions by him said, I remember Mr. M'Call calling on me. I said I did not know Barrett, and had never heard of him, and that no such man was introduced to me by O'Neill. I said I did not remember any man coming to my house to get boots buttoned. Captain M'Call spoke of a row, and I did not understand what he meant. In fact, he completely humbugged me.

The witness M'Manus, the friend to whom Barrett's letter was communicated, was recalled, and cross-examined very minutely.

The Attorney-General then replied upon the whole case. Addressing himself to the *alibi*, he premised that the evidence for the prosecution, particularly that of the lad Morris and Mrs. Koeppel, showed conclusively that Barrett was in town some weeks before and on the 13th of December. He commented upon the absence in Barrett's letter of any statement that Mullen had introduced Barrett to M'Nulty, as the latter had described, and upon the improbability that Mullen, himself a shoemaker, should have introduced Barrett to M'Nulty in order to have his boots soled. He turned next to the second branch of the *alibi*, referring first to Mr. Peter M'Corrie, whom he described as connected with a paper in which the most detestable and seditious writing habitually appeared. Adverting again to the letter written by Barrett from Millbank, the Attorney-General said it was strange that there was no allusion whatever in that letter to the meeting at "the Bell" on the 13th of December, or to the private tea-meeting immediately afterwards, or to M'Corrie playing the piano. According to the witness Burgoyne, from August to the latter part of December Barrett was in Glasgow. If that were so, why were not men with whom or for whom he worked, or persons with whom he lodged, called to corroborate that statement? Why should it rest on the evidence of one man? Morris and

the woman Koeppel, who saw him from day to day in London and on the evening of the explosion, could not have been mistaken. Before the explosion they saw him with his whiskers on, and on the evening of it the woman Koeppel saw him with them off. When she next saw him in London after his arrest his whiskers were growing. Where were those persons a man would naturally have called to prove he was twelve hours' distance by an express?

The Lord Chief Justice then proceeded to charge the jury. He said the evidence of the alleged conspiracy to release Burke rested upon the evidence of Mullany, and he must without doubt be looked upon as an accomplice in the act that had been done. It was doubtless competent for juries, if they believed the testimony of an accomplice, to act upon it, even if it were not corroborated; but juries had for a long series of years been recommended by the Judges not to convict upon the evidence of a man who came forward to save his own life at the expense of others, unless his evidence was corroborated. The jury must, however, bear in mind that it was not necessary the evidence of an approver should be confirmed in every particular. If it could be so confirmed, his evidence would not be required at all. Happily for society, men who were engaged in offences of this kind, when danger and detection were impending, were very apt to turn upon one another, and to denounce each other to the police. It might be hoped, from the present and many other examples, that those who were mixed up with them in these treasonable practices would learn that their greatest danger was to be found at the hands of those with whom they had been most intimately associated. After recapitulating the evidence of Mullany on the plan for effecting the liberation of Burke, the Lord Chief Justice examined how far that evidence was corroborated by other testimony. Adverting to the remarkable incident of the letter, his lordship said that when the jury heard Mullany tell the story of that letter they must have received it with doubt and suspicion. It was not every one who knew that secret communications could be carried on by chloride of gold and rendered visible by a solution of copperas; and the incident might have savoured more or less of romance had it not been confirmed by a most marvellous combination of circumstances. When Burke was arrested there was found upon him a small glass bulb, hermetically sealed, containing a certain mineral substance, which when analyzed by a scientific chemist, turned out to be chloride of gold. It was also shown that Mrs. Barry endeavoured to introduce in Burke's stockings a portion of green copperas. The inference was that this man by means of these substances found the opportunity of carrying on a secret correspondence with these persons outside the prison, and thus one of the statements of Mullany was corroborated. The conduct of Burke within the prison was not likely to mislead the jury. It was quite clear that it was the purpose of the conspirators to blow down the wall of the prison on the 12th of December, and that Burke was aware of the event, and prepared to take advantage of it. It had not been shown how it was arranged that the throwing of a ball over the prison wall should be used as a signal, but a ball was used as a signal on both days. When the ball was thrown over on the 12th Burke fell out of the ring in which he was exercising with the other prisoners, went to the furthest part of the exercise ground, leaned against the wall, and took off his boot as if to take a stone out of it. He did all this with the utmost possible slowness and deliberation, tardily putting on his boot and returning to his place when he could not help doing so. No one could doubt that Burke was aware of what was going on, and that all was done according to the arrangements which he had probably

himself suggested. The conduct of Burke was such as strongly to confirm the testimony of Mullany. The attempt to blow up the prison wall on the 12th and the blowing up of the wall on the 13th could not have been effected unless, at least, three or four, or perhaps more, persons had been connected with it. Looking to all these circumstances, the Lord Chief Justice said it would certainly appear that Mullany was truthful in his statement of the design of the conspirators and the means by which it was to be accomplished. That still left the question to be considered whether Mullany was confirmed as to the particular individuals whom he alleged to have taken part in the explosion. His lordship then went over the evidence of witnesses who had seen the attempt of the 12th of December, and the explosion of the 13th. Having gone into the testimony affecting, respectively, William Desmond, Timothy Desmond, and English, the Lord Chief Justice proceeded to say that the *alibi* set up in the case of Barrett was the most remarkable that he remembered in the whole course of his experience. If they believed the witnesses examined for the defence, there was an end of the case against Barrett, but in that case Mrs. Koepfel, Morris, and the witnesses for the Crown either laboured under the strangest hallucination, or else it was a falsehood the most wicked and basest that was ever offered in a court of justice to destroy the life of this man. There could not be a shadow of doubt that there was a man who played the part that Mullany spoke of, but was there some one to whom all the circumstances deposed by the witnesses in London applied but who was not Barrett? He therefore said that this was one of the most remarkable instances of an *alibi* he ever remembered, because they were not dealing with the case of a man who was charged with an offence by those who knew and saw him only for the moment and who had no acquaintance with him before, but an *alibi* set up and dealing with witnesses who had known the man for months, who were in almost daily intercourse with him, and who saw and spoke to him before and after the explosion. The jury would say whether, from the position and demeanour of some, at least, of the witnesses who spoke to the identity of Barrett, they were not entitled to credit; while, on the other hand, there were circumstances so remarkable and peculiar in the case of the *alibi* for the defence, that they required their most vigilant attention before they adopted it. The first and most startling reason was that the jury had heard of this defence during the last three or four days for the first time. What was the natural course of a man who found himself implicated in a charge the very nature of which was calculated to excite horror in the mind of any man of common humanity? Would they not expect such a man to say that his defence was a very simple one, that he had not been in London for months; that he had been in Glasgow all the time, and was known to many people there. Would he not say, "I was at Glasgow long before the explosion and at the time when it happened, and I can produce the people who saw me?" If he had done so, the law would have lent him the assistance he required to bring these witnesses to London. But not one word to that effect had been stated. The Lord Chief Justice then recapitulated the evidence first of the three shoemakers, and then of Burgoyne, M'Manus, and M'Corrie, and remarked that, at first sight, it seemed perfectly conclusive and satisfactory. It was just possible that the statement of the shoemakers was true, and that they did repair the boots, and that the alterations did take place with M'Nulty, but that the whole affair might have taken place a week later. The second branch of the *alibi* related to the meetings at Glasgow, in which it was alleged Barrett took part. It still required the evi-

dence of those who lodged and lived and were in daily intercourse with them. Barrett must have had a home of some sort. Some one must have known where he slept, and who could have come and said it was a total mistake to suppose he was in London at the time of the explosion. Some one could have said, "He was lodging in my house," and others, either employers or fellow-workmen, could have spoken for him when it was all-important he should give an account of himself.

The jury then retired to consider their verdict. They remained in deliberation for two hours and a half. When they returned their lordships were sent for, the prisoners were placed at the dock, and amid breathless silence the names of the jury were called over.

Clerk of the Arraignment.—How say you, gentlemen of the jury, is William Desmond guilty or not guilty?

Foreman.—"Not guilty."

Clerk of the Arraignment.—Is Timothy Desmond guilty or not guilty?

Foreman.—"Not guilty."

Clerk of the Arraignment.—Is Nicholas English guilty or not guilty?

Foreman.—"Not guilty."

Clerk of the Arraignment.—Is Michael Barrett guilty or not guilty?

Foreman.—"Guilty."

Clerk of the Arraignment.—You say that William Desmond, Timothy Desmond, and Nicholas English are "Not guilty," and that Michael Barrett is "Guilty," and that is the verdict of you all?

Foreman.—It is.

The three prisoners first named were then removed from the dock. Barrett, on being asked, as usual, if he had any thing to say why sentence of death should not be passed, made an able and eloquent speech, and the Lord Chief Justice, after expressing his concurrence in the verdict of the jury, passed sentence of death upon the prisoner.

II.

LYON *v.* HOME.

THIS suit was commenced on the 20th of April before Vice-Chancellor Giffard. It was instituted by a lady named Lyon, the widow of a deceased merchant, against the well-known table-turner, table-rapper, and so-called "spiritualist," Daniel Douglas Home, who called himself Daniel Home Lyon, and claimed to be a spiritual medium, with power to evoke the spirits of deceased persons, to compel the restoration of moneys and securities for money to the amount of 60,000*l.*, which the plaintiff gave to him and transferred for his benefit, when, as she alleged, she was subject to great influence and ascendancy by him, owing to her belief at the time in his pretended spiritual powers.

Mr. W. M. James, Q.C., opened the case by reading from the bill of complaint the substance of the plaintiff's case, and an affidavit of the plaintiff in substantiation of it. The plaintiff Mrs. Lyon, was a lady advanced in life, whose husband died in 1859, leaving her the absolute control over a large fortune. She alleged in her affidavit that before dying her husband informed her that he believed a change would come in seven years from his death, and that they would

meet. This she interpreted to mean that she would die in 1866, but in that year her views on the point changed, in consequence of information received by her from a female photographer in Westbourne-Grove, to whom she had gone to have a photograph of her deceased husband copied. The photographer told her that death was unnecessary in order to meet him, and directed her to become a spiritualist. She also lent Mrs. Lyon books on the art of spiritualism, and directed her attention to the great head medium, Mr. Home, who had just opened an Athenæum at Sloane-street for the encouragement of the belief. Mrs. Lyon was also advised to become a subscriber to the institution. She immediately wrote to the defendant Home for a prospectus and particulars of the Athenæum, and offered to pay a subscription. Mr. Home having sent her no reply, she stated that, on the 3rd of October, 1866, she went to 72, Sloane-street, where the Athenæum was, and where Mr. Home resided. She was shown upstairs into a room where Mr. Home was sitting in company with a table, which, directly after the plaintiff had stated the case, began, with praiseworthy zeal, to rap a message. Home said at once that "this was a call for the alphabet." Up to that time the plaintiff was ignorant that messages arrived from spirits through medium only, and that an arrangement had been come to between the invisible world and the visible table; that one rap should signify the negative, three raps the affirmative, and five raps a call for the alphabet. The *modus operandi* by the alphabet was that on each letter being pointed out or uttered the spirit rapped when he had got the letter he wanted, and so somewhat painfully the oracle was delivered. Home then, by means of the alphabet applied orally, developed the following message from the spirit of the deceased Mr. Lyon:—"My own beloved Jane,—I am Charles, your beloved husband. I live to bless you, my own precious darling, I am with you always. I love, love, love you." The spirit further added, "I have no power to speak more; but I will never leave you more, my own darling." The plaintiff, who was greatly cheered and comforted by this precious intelligence, proposed to reward Mr. Home by a handsome subscription, but having no cheque with her she postponed the donation till a second interview, when amongst other things the spirit, interpreted by Home, informed her, "I love, love, love you. Be very calm. I will touch you." These interviews were worth to Mr. Home or his Athenæum, the sums of 30*l.* and 50*l.* The plaintiff had no child by the deceased spirit, but this omission was rectified at a third interview between Home and the plaintiff at the plaintiff's house. The spirit then, with Home's assistance, communicated the tidings, "I love Daniel," meaning presumably the modern prophet, "he is to be your son; he is my son—therefore yours." The table then ecstatically kicked up its legs, and the spirit continued, "I am happy, happy. In a little time I will make myself visible to you. Oh, do not say that the light of other days is gone. I am with you," or words to that effect. The effect of this intelligence was overwhelming. The defendant, Home, further informed her that it was the will of the spirit that she should adopt him as her son, that a friend of Home's named Hall should be sent for, and that she should produce stock receipts for the sum of about 24,000*l.* Under the influence, as Mrs. Lyon alleged, of Home's spiritual powers and ascendancy, she went on the 10th of October, 1866, to the Bank of England, and there transferred the sum of 24,000*l.* stock to Home. Shortly after this Home, at another spiritual interview, assured her that it was the spirit's will that she should destroy her existing will and make another will bequeathing every thing she possessed to Home, and that a Dr. Hawksley and a Mr.

Rudall were to be the attesting witnesses. The will to this effect was soon afterwards prepared for the defendant by William Martin Wilkinson, a solicitor of Lincoln's-inn-fields, and was executed by the plaintiff, and attested by Mr. Wilkinson and Mr. Hall. The plaintiff's property was said to be worth nearly 150,000*l*. It was not surprising that, on the strength of these spiritual communications, Home enrolled a deed on the 3rd of December, 1866, by which he assumed the name of Lyon. On the 10th of the same December the plaintiff was again induced to go to the Bank and transfer to Home 6700*l*. more stock. On the 12th of December she executed a deed-poll prepared by Wilkinson, and not approved by any solicitor on her behalf. This deed recited her intention to transfer the above sums of stock for the absolute benefit of Home, and she did thereby, in order to "remove all doubts, suspicions, and controversies, irrevocably declare that such gift was made of her own free will and pleasure, and without any influence or control" by the defendant Home. On the 19th of January, 1867, another deed was executed by her, also prepared by Wilkinson, and also not approved of by any solicitor on her behalf. By this deed, which was made between her and Wilkinson, after a recital that she was entitled to 30,000*l*. then out on mortgage, and that it was her intention to make further provision for her adopted son, she thereby declared that she had of her free will and pleasure, and without any influence, control, or interference by him, determined absolutely and irrevocably to settle the said sum for his benefit, retaining the interest only during her life. The deed then contained a settlement of the money and the securities for the same for Home's benefit, and a proviso and declaration by the plaintiff that such settlement was absolute and irrevocable, and should not be disputed by her or her representatives, and that what was thereby settled should be in addition to previous gifts. On the 21st of February, 1867, she was again induced to go to the Bank and transfer 2290*l*. stock to Home's name. On the 13th of March, 1867, Home or Lyon sold out 20,000*l*. stock, and advanced it to Wilkinson, or others, on certain mortgage securities. The bill concluded with a charge that the plaintiff discovered she had been imposed upon, and that the gifts had been made under the spiritual influence of the defendant, and submitted that she was entitled to have the gifts set aside. The bill prayed that the gifts might be declared void, and for a retransfer of the funds and a retransfer and assignment of all securities for the same, and for a writ of *ne exeat regno*.

Mr. Druce, Q.C., put in the evidence in support of the plaintiff's case. Mrs. Lyon, in her affidavit, alleged that she would never have given the defendant any thing beyond a subscription of 5*l*. to the Athenæum, had it not been for the belief in his spiritual manifestations, and that it was the command of her husband's spirit that she should give the money to him. She denied that she had taken from the defendant the articles of jewellery and wearing apparel as alleged by him, remarking that they had been given to her by the defendant, and that she would return them when he returned the property given to him by her. She had never adopted any other person than the defendant, but she had made and revoked several wills since her husband's death. The letters she had written to the defendant were mostly written under his influence, and often in accordance with his instructions, or from drafts prepared by him, which drafts he had always requested her to destroy. She denied that she had any personal affection for the defendant, but had adopted him as her son in consequence of his systematic imposition. She denied the truth of the majority of the allegations contained in the defendant's answer, stating that she certainly would not have

given him the money had he not induced her to believe in his "spiritual manifestations," and she had never told him any thing to the contrary, nor was it a fact that she had ever had to press the defendant to accept any of her gifts. At the *séances* held at her house "raps" and "tilts" took place, but never had any communications. On one occasion, however, she had had a communication through another medium, when the following message had been "rapped out :"—"Avoid the table until the trial comes off," and she had carefully followed the advice. She had always been a superstitious person, and had consequently become a victim to imposition.

Mrs. Denison was called, and examined by Mr. Matthews, Q.C. She said, I first saw Mrs. Lyon after her husband's death in 1866. Mrs. Lyon predicted her death at that time, and wished me to go with her to her husband's grave. She said that some great change was to take place, and it struck me as being very strange. My impression was that her mind was not quite right upon that subject. I was once asked to be executrix to one of Mrs. Lyon's wills.

The evidence of Mrs. Fellows, the widow of the plaintiff's nephew, was then read. She spoke to the defendant having visited the plaintiff. The plaintiff had told her that her husband's spirit had commanded her to adopt the defendant as her son. Mrs. Lyon also told her that she was to have communication with no other medium than himself. She said that she believed that the message was from her husband's spirit. Whilst listening at the door of the plaintiff's room, when the defendant was with the plaintiff, she heard rappings and the defendant repeating letters of the alphabet, and she heard the plaintiff say, "Oh, my dear Charles, in words so changed." The plaintiff had also told her that her husband's spirit had adopted the defendant as his son. On another occasion the defendant and another gentleman were in the room with the plaintiff, and she heard one of them say something about 500*l.*, 200*l.*, and 700*l.*; and she afterwards heard one of the gentlemen say, "Thank you, dear spirit." The witness also spoke to the execution of the will, at which time she was also listening at the door. On several occasions she had, whilst listening, heard the defendant say, "Let us consult father." She had also heard the defendant urge the plaintiff to leave her apartments, as there was some evil influence there, which drove the spirits away. The defendant had on one occasion his eyes bandaged, and pretended to go into trances, and whilst in that state dictated letters to the solicitor and the gentlemen who had attested the will, leading her to suppose that it was her husband's spirit who was dictating. Witness believed that the plaintiff was the victim of gross imposition, and was under the impression that in all she was doing for the defendant she was obeying the command of her husband's spirit.

Mrs. Sims, of Westbourne-grove, also gave evidence as to her belief that the plaintiff had been deceived by the defendant, and that it was owing to those deceptions that she had been induced to give him her property.

Mrs. Pepper said that the plaintiff was much attached to her husband, and it was to that in a measure that the defendant had been enabled to impose upon her. She also went at length into many of the transactions between the plaintiff, remarking that in all of them she appeared to believe that she was obeying the commands of her husband's spirit.

Mrs. Lyon, the plaintiff, was then called and examined. She said, I was married in August, 1823. In 1859 my husband died. During my married life I lived at Binchester, in the county of Durham. Latterly we lived near Bedfont. My husband had a great number of relations. Before his death my

husband was separated from his family, owing to a little difficulty which arose over some property. Nearly all the family took my husband's brother's side in the matter. Binchester was sold for his debts. My husband considered himself wronged by his family, and consequently quarrelled with them. My husband made over to me the greater bulk of his property. Neither in his life nor by his will did any of his relations come into his property. After my husband's death I lived at Bridport for about a year and a half. It was my husband's wish that I should go to London. On one occasion we were sitting together, and he said something to the effect that he would be just the same as he was then. We were talking about death, and he said, "I shall be just the same as I am now." I said, "Will you be with me?" and he said, "Yes." I said, "Will you speak to me?" and he said, "Better not." I said, "Can you speak?" and he did not answer, I think. I went to Mrs. Tucker's in January, 1861, after which I went to Yarmouth. When I left Yarmouth I went to live with Mrs. Jane Fellows. I intended to live there, but left because I was displeased with her insisting upon having the house painted. Although I was very much displeased, we were still friendly. I left my luggage there, and occasionally go to look after it. I then went to lodge at Mrs. Key's. I made inquiries for the "Spiritual Athenæum," but no one could tell me where to find it. I had read several books on spiritualism, amongst which was Mr. Home's book. I had a photograph of Home from Mrs. Sims. She is a photographer, and sold me the portrait. I have had very extraordinary dreams for many years, and sometimes I might have had more than dreams—visions, in fact. I had heard such a great deal about spiritualism from Mrs. Sims that I was led to make inquiries. I told Mrs. Sims that I was going to my husband's tomb. She said that he was not there, but thought if I became a spiritualist he would very likely come to me. I did not know the name of any of the servants at the Sloane-street Athenæum. I know Miss Georgina Houghton. If I talked to her or any of Home's friends I told them the truth, but they tell so many stories that you can't believe them. I told Home in the Athenæum that in seven years a change was going to take place. He asked me to go up to his rooms. I did not go up at my own request. I did not tell Miss Houghton that I examined every thing in his room, nor that I allowed him to go to my wardrobe or drawers. I did not tell her that I gave him money because I loved him. The second time I saw him I gave him 30*l*. I fancied on one occasion that he was suggesting that I should marry, but I silenced him at once. I would not marry the best man alive. It was at the third interview when he brought the spoon. I was not particularly irritated. I silenced him at once, for I saw what was coming. It was then the raps came upon the table. I never went to the defendant's rooms. It is untrue. I went there at first, but not on the 8th. I think I saw Mr. Hall on the 8th of October. Home came first.

Mr. Matthews, drew attention to the affidavit in which the plaintiff stated that Hall was brought by the defendant.

The plaintiff said that must be untrue or a mistake. Home came first. When Mr. Hall came, after a few minutes' conversation, he told me that he had heard that it was my wish that Daniel (the defendant) should be made independent. I said that the spirit had spelt out that Daniel was his son, and that he wished me to make him independent of the world. I asked him what he thought would make him independent, and he replied about two or three hundred a year. I do not remember his asking whether I had any relations who

were likely to oppose liberality to a stranger. I never told Hall that I intended to adopt the defendant. I never was fond of Home. I was fond of my husband, and was pleased that he could bring him to converse with him.

Mr. Matthews.—Do you mean to say you were not attached to the defendant? Certainly not. Never. I deliberately state that I never was attached to him.—Did you not love him? No; I never loved him.—Then why did you write, “I am sure it is a mother’s maternal love towards her beloved child?” I cannot say why I wrote it. My husband’s spirit spelt out, “Daniel is my son, and my son is your son, and therefore he is your son.”—What do you mean by subscribing yourself, “Your Loving Mother, Jane Lyon,” in your letter to him? I am sure I do not know.

Mr. Matthews then read a letter from the plaintiff to the defendant at a time when he was ill, in which she appeared to be particularly solicitous as to his health. In the same letter there was the following: “There is great work for you to do. I am gifted with a knowledge which you have not.” What do you mean by that last sentence? I am sure I cannot say.—Had you any kindly affection to the defendant’s son? I wished to do as my husband’s spirit had commanded me.—Do you mean by that that you had no affectionate feeling towards the boy? Yes: I don’t see why I should have affection for him.

Cross-examined.—I had a dream which led me to believe that I should have a son. I dreamed that I saw a boy with golden hair unlocking a book. The boy appeared to be addressing a number of people from a sort of pulpit. He was addressing the people, but what he said I do not know. The boy was very like a portrait of my husband taken when a boy. I do not remember telling Mr. Perdicaris that when I saw Home at the piano I recognized in his profile the boy I saw in my dream.

The learned counsel here read a letter from the plaintiff to the defendant, dated the 15th of October, in which, speaking of his son, she said, “He is a dear boy, I love him, and have kissed him many times.”

Mr. Matthews. Is that true? It may be.—Then in another letter you say, “Will you, darling?” Whose darling did you mean? I suppose I meant my husband’s darling.—Then in another letter you subscribe yourself, “My darling son, your affectionate and loving mother, Jane Lyon?” That is too loving by half.—That is the way you write to a man you have no affection for? Yes: to a man I have no affection for—to a man whom I had only seen once or twice; but it was to a man for whom my husband’s spirit had expressed affection.—In a letter dated 24th of October you say, “My dear Daniel,—You say ‘Don’t worry about my health.’ I can’t help it.” Did you distress yourself about it? I wrote it, at any rate; but read the letter through.—Then you go on to say, “God has given me a son, and I much fear he is on the brink of a precipice, and the least push will send you headlong.” Do you believe that you were not anxious about his health at that time? Yes, I believe I was not anxious.—Do you mean to say that deliberately? Yes, I do; it was all owing to the commands of my husband’s spirit.—Then, why do you say nothing about your husband’s spirit in any of the letters? Why should I write? He knew all about the interposition of my husband’s spirit.

Cross-examination continued.—I saw a notice in the newspaper that a lady had given the defendant a sum of money, and Mr. Clutterbuck expressed a hope that I was not the lady. Mrs. James Fellows told me that I was under improper influence.

Mr. Matthews.—What did you answer? I thought all was correct at the time, believing that I was obeying the command of my husband's spirit.—Were you displeased with her? No.

Cross-examination continued.—I had seen Mrs. Hall, and some other of Dan's spiritual friends, and I told them the same story I had told Mrs. Fellows. I have always told the same story. I did not, as early as the 1st of November, contemplate leaving Mrs. Key's lodgings.

Mr. Matthews.—Do you say that deliberately? I do. I certainly did not at that time contemplate leaving.

Mr. Matthews then put in a letter, bearing date November 1, to Mrs. Hall, in which she said, "We mean to look out for apartments."

The Plaintiff.—I do not know why I should have said so. I did not mean it. One of the Halls had been writing to me, teasing me about going into better apartments, and I wrote, I suppose, to put them off.—Did you tell her that your money had made two people happy; one was Daniel and the other yourself? I may have done so.—Did you tell her that as soon as you saw Home you knew his profile? No.—Did you ever tell her that you knew you would adopt a son? No, certainly not. I never said such a thing.

Cross-examination continued.—Mrs. Pratt may have said, "You have been very kind to Home."

Mr. Matthews.—Did Mr. Home ask you to allow him to retain the name of Home? I remember the spirit of the Earl of Alexander being called by the defendant, and it said the name of Home was as respectable as that of Lyon.

Mr. Matthews then read the letter from the plaintiff to Mr. Wilkinson, the solicitor, who was one of the defendants, asking him to draw up her will in favour of the defendant Home.

The Plaintiff.—Every word in that letter was dictated by Daniel whilst in a trance, and I wrote it thinking it was my husband's spirit who was dictating. I also wrote letters at the same time to the two attesting witnesses. A day or two after that Daniel told me to burn my old wills. I did every thing and wrote every thing under the magnetic influence of the medium. I do not remember seeing Perdicaris just before I left Westbourne-place. I do not remember having said to him that I never saw Home in a trance. I had never a strong dislike to my husband's relatives. I did not express dislike of them to Mr. Lefevre, Mrs. Phillips, Mrs. Cox, Mrs. Hall, or Perdicaris.

Cross-examination continued.—The defendant wrote a history of his adoption by me, but it was incorrect, and I consequently destroyed it, writing my version of the matter in its place. I asked Dan why he so wrote the account, and he replied, "My father told me to do it, as there may be law some day." I said, "I will destroy it, for I like the truth." He said, "Don't destroy it," and I kept it for a little while.

Mr. Matthews.—Was the history any thing like the defendant's answer? Yes, something. He said something about love and such like, and it was distasteful to me. I wrote the history from scraps of memoranda I had. I think there was some allusion to the defendant living in the same house with me, but I treated it with contempt. I considered there would be impropriety. People might talk. We know they will talk, as they have already done. All the letters I have written have been written whilst I was under the influence of the medium. I must have been under strong influence, or I would not have done what I did. If I was not under the influence I must have been insane, for

* nobody in their senses would have done what I did. The spirit spelt out 24,000*l.* was not respectable for our family, and that our son must have 30,000*l.*, and I accordingly gave him the other 6000*l.* Dan had such a way of running over the letters when the spirit was spelling out, that I could not understand. I said, "You don't give enough time;" and he replied, "I know what it is before it comes;" and I said, "You had better write without the spirit at all."

The Plaintiff was then cross-examined on the letters which passed between her and Mr. Wilkinson, the solicitor, as to the preparation of the deeds. Mr. Matthews put each letter into the plaintiff's hand, and closely pressed her as to whether the expressions used in them were intended by her at the time, and whether the evident knowledge of business, and clear view of the consequences of what she was doing were consistent with her statements that every thing was done under Mr. Home's influence. Mr. Wilkinson frequently warned her against the danger of parting with the control of so large a fortune; intimated that the 30,000*l.* was amply sufficient for a man in Home's position, if she was resolved to confirm that gift; and pressed upon her consideration the fact that her husband's relatives had claims upon her, and that she had made no provision for them. Mr. Wilkinson in one letter pointed out the desirability of employing an independent solicitor, inasmuch as he had been so long intimately connected with the defendant Home. Mrs. Lyon, however, in her reply, persisted that she had full confidence in Mr. Wilkinson, that the spirits had told her that he was "steel," and, in language as clear, sensible, and acute as the keenest man of business could employ, expressed her resolve to make the gifts and settlements in question. Mrs. Lyon's invariable replies to Mr. Matthews' questions as to whether she had not written and expressed herself as appears in her letters, were—"If I wrote any thing of that sort it was under the influence of the medium; almost all that I wrote was through influence or from copies laid before or written under the dictation of the spirits." "I wrote under influence; I was doing it like a mad person." On being frequently asked, "Was this letter written by you either from a draft laid before you or at dictation?" she replied, "I do not remember which. It must have been one or the other. It was all done under influence. I was spiritually mad; I was acting entirely under the direction of the spirit. I am not a fool or a madwoman, but I have acted as such." The draft of the deed of gift was perused by her, and a recital to the effect that all her husband's family were well provided for was struck out by her, with a marginal note that she did not approve of it. A part of Wilkinson's affidavit was read, in which he swore that he read over the deed of gift to her; that she then stated that the more she saw Home the more she liked him, and that she was not influenced by any thing but the wish to put him in an independent position, and to save legacy duty; that he reminded her of her relatives' claims, and the possibility that she would regret the step she was taking, and had better give property to hospitals, and that she informed him she had considered the matter in every way, and determined to do what she had done. As to these allegations the plaintiff answered that perhaps "the ninety-ninth part was true—very little." Mr. Matthews then cross-examined the plaintiff on each separate allegation in that part of Mr. Wilkinson's affidavit, with the only result, however, of repeated assertions by her that every intention and act which she had or did in reference to the matter were under the influence of Home and the spirits. Being reminded that Mr. Wilkinson had often said to her, "I do not want to know what the spirits wish you to do, I want to know what you wish to do yourself," she replied that although he had

said this, it was in order to make out a case if the gifts should be attached after her death. Her attention was also called to the great care she had shown when the settlement of the 30,000*l.* on mortgage was being prepared, to provide for the due securing of the interest to herself during her life, and to the numerous suggestions made by her on the subject, showing that she well knew what she was doing, and was careful about the best mode of carrying out her intention. Nearly every question on this head brought the invariable answer, "I was under the influence of the 'sperrits.'" She also said, "Why should I give this to him if I had not thought my husband's spirit wished it?" "My husband's spirit repeatedly said, 'You haven't done, my darling Jane, what I wished. Write to Mr. Wilkinson to finish the matter.'"

Mr. Matthews read several extracts from the answer of Mr. Wilkinson, and in almost every instance the plaintiff said that they were substantially correct.

Mr. Matthews.—Do you remember that whilst one of the deeds was being looked at you had your arm round the defendant's neck? No, certainly not; but I do remember that he had one of his arms round my waist, and one of his hands upon my head, smoothing my hair. He was sitting upon a chair by my side.—Do you remember asking Mr. Hartley, one of the gentlemen who was present, whether he thought a lawyer could pick a hole in the deed of trust? No.

Cross-examination continued.—About the end of January Mr. Home went away to Hastings, and it was during that time the mortgage was executed.

Mr. Matthews read a letter dated January 28, from plaintiff to the defendant, in which she said, "Inquire of the spirits, if you can, whose face it was they have given me now to look at instead of yours. I will not describe it. It was an extraordinary face, like no one I ever saw. I first saw your face; and then the face of another appeared to me. Can it be ——?" Whose face was that? I suppose it was one of the delusions.—Whose face was it? Some face in a dream, I suppose. The magnetic influence was there. Home had been gone three days at that time. He returned from Hastings earlier than I expected. He came back on the Thursday instead of the Saturday. I was in his room when he returned. I went to ask his secretary to lend me a letter I had sent to Mr. Home, for I thought there was some mistake as to the date. Mr. Home came in and found me there with his letters about. It was the duty of Mr. Phillips to examine his letters.

Mr. Matthews.—Have you from time to time asked Mr. Phillips to let you have the letters you had written to Home? I only tried to get one letter. That was the one I first wrote, asking about the subscription to the Athenæum.—What possible object could you have in wanting to get that letter? Simply because there was a wrong address and date upon it, and I wished to have it corrected.—Have you not had other letters of yours from his secretary? No, only that one.—How did you know that the letter was incorrectly dated? I believe Dan told me.—Did you alter it? Yes.—What alteration did you make? I cannot say.

Mr. Matthews here put in the letter, and the plaintiff upon looking at it, said that she had not altered the date, but only the address, substituting Westbourne-place for Westbourne-terrace.

Cross-examined.—Phillips allowed me to see some of the letters I had written to the defendant.

Mr. Matthews.—Do you remember when you first left off signing yourself

* "mother" in your letters to him? No; I left off by degrees. I left off signing "affectionately," but he begged me to put it in again, and I did so out of pity, for he said it deprived him of sleep.—What was your reason for leaving off signing yourself "mother"? • Because I did not wish to be on such intimate terms.

Mr. Matthews (putting in a letter dated March 19).—Can you tell me whether this is the date at which you left off signing yourself "mother"? That was the last time I signed my letters to him in that manner.

Mr. Matthews put in a letter, dated May 4, 1867, written to the defendant whilst at Malvern, in which, after making tender inquiries as to his health, she requested him in the future to put in all his letters the day of the month and address.

Mr. Matthews.—Could you not let him have his own way in such a simple matter as that? • Certainly not, because it is proper that every body should give a date to their letters. You will see that I did not sign myself "mother" in that letter.

Cross-examination continued.—Mr. Jenkin called upon me in consequence of a letter I wrote to him on the 30th of June, 1867. I did not complain of Mr. Home's neglect of me and of his ill-health.

Mr. Matthews.—Did you say to him that "the 30,000*l.* first given was my own free gift"? No, certainly not—never—never.—Did you not say to Mr. Jenkin that the first 30,000*l.* was given of your own free will, but that Home and Wilkinson had conspired together to obtain the other? No, it is all untrue—concocted by the spiritualists.—Did you take a dislike to the defendant's son because he squirted orange-juice over the sofa? No, certainly not. It was because he was a very rude and impertinent boy.

Mr. Matthews then read a letter dated May 27, 1867, in which she said, "And the spirits say that you will be strong again in ten days."

Plaintiff (interrupting).—He said that the spirits said so.

Mr. Matthews.—No, he said that the doctor had said so. The learned counsel proceeded to read the letter, which went on to say, "That will soon be up, and then you will prove their powers. The time has not come for them to display it; however, the great God's will must be done, and we must all succumb to that sooner or later, and as the world goes there is not much worth living for, and if we have not health there is nothing if robbed of life's great blessing—we but drag on our weary way with pain, distaste, and sorrow; but let us look forward into the mystery of mysteries, another and a better state—another world. 'Oh, wad some power the giftie gie us, to see that world as spirits see it.'"

Mr. Matthews.—Had you ever any idea that your life was not safe with Home? No, certainly not. A poor sickly fellow like him could not take any body's life.—What was the first thing that opened your eyes? When Dan said the spirits had nothing to do with the gift—just before the last time he went to Malvern. He called the spirit of my husband, and said, "Father, did mother have any manifestation before she gave the money?" and the spirit replied, "You are quite right, Daniel." I said it was a lie, and that the spirits were not to be relied upon.

The re-examination of the plaintiff by Mr. James occupied only a few minutes. Throughout she gave her evidence in a manner which showed her to be a thorough woman of business, and that she was thoroughly acquainted with every part of

her case, and with the affidavits of both sides. In almost every instance she anticipated the question the learned counsel was about to put, proving that she had, at least, a wonderful memory for so aged a woman.

Mrs. J. Fellows, the plaintiff's niece, was next called and cross-examined by Mr. Matthews. She said, I have heard my aunt speak whilst in the room with the defendant. I heard her on one occasion say, "Let me see him." I heard that the plaintiff had made a will, but did not hear any thing about the mortgages, or deed of gift. Mrs. Lyon told me that the defendant was about to change his name. Her manner to the defendant was not at all affectionate. She called him Daniel.

Mr. James asked no questions in re-examination.

Mrs. Thos. Key was the next witness, cross-examined by Mr. Matthews. She said, When Mrs. Lyon was with me I got anxious about her. I thought she was being grossly imposed upon, and I wished to communicate with her friends. I had listened before I spoke to Mrs. J. Fellows, and she asked me to continue listening. I never said any thing about the matter to any of her visitors. I never saw Home and Mrs. Lyon together, and therefore I cannot say what her manner towards him was.

Mrs. Elizabeth Fellows in her cross-examination said, Mrs. Key told me that she had repeatedly listened at the plaintiff's door, and I asked her to continue it. I most certainly objected to what was going on between the defendant and Mrs. Lyon. I first told Mrs. Lyon that she was being imposed upon on the 9th of November. I remember on one occasion she said that the spirit had given a sort of groan, and that Mr. Home had said that the spirit was hoarse. I remember on another occasion when I cracked a biscuit she said, "There's a spirit." I laughed, and she said, "Dan was right; he said you would laugh at it."

Mrs. Sarah Pepper, in her cross-examination said that she had no reason to set the plaintiff against Home, but she had endeavoured to set her against spirit-rapping.

Mr. Druce, Q.C., then proceeded to address the Court upon the case for the plaintiff, pointing out that most of the things had taken place at times when the defendant had taken care that there should be no corroborative evidence, and he was therefore obliged to say that mainly the case rested upon the evidence of the plaintiff. There was a strong presumption in favour of the plaintiff's general account, which made out a case of influence. She was a lady who had an unbounded affection for her husband whilst alive, and no less was her affection for his memory after his death, and believed, through the defendant's instrumentality, that she could again be brought into communication with her husband. The defendant, he argued, knew of this, and acted upon it, in order to possess himself of her property.

Mr. Fischer followed on the same side.

Mr. Matthews then addressed the Court for the defendant Home, after which the affidavits of a large number of witnesses were examined by the learned counsel for the defendant.

Mr. Rudall, one of the witnesses who attested the will, said, I saw Mrs. Lyon, the plaintiff, for the first time on the day of Mr. Home's return from the country, when I met him by appointment at her lodgings at 18, Westbourne-place. I believe it was about the 1st of November last. On being introduced to her I said, "I am sure all Mr. Home's friends and well-wishers ought to thank you for what you have done for him, and I do so for one," to which she replied, "And I thank

the Lord for having given me the opportunity of doing it." In this I refer to her gift to him of 24,000*l*. I did not see or hear of Mrs. Lyon again before the receipt of a letter from her asking me to call on the 12th of November, at a quarter to 5 p.m., on some matter relating to her adopted son (Mr. Home). I was quite ignorant of the object of this summons. I found at Westbourne-place, besides Mrs. Lyon, Mr. Home, Mr. Wilkinson, and Dr. Hawksley. Mr. Home was not in the room, and Mrs. Lyon informed us that her motive in requesting us to be present was that we might attest her will. Mr. Wilkinson expressed his reluctance to act as her solicitor in the matter, and said he would much prefer that she should consult with some other lawyer. She answered that there was no necessity for any thing of the kind, and requested him to proceed to business. He made many inquiries as to the propriety of her leaving her property as she had done, and made so many objections that at first I was under the suspicion that he was doing all he could to prevent her making a will. Before signing she made a sort of little speech, and reiterated very solemnly and earnestly that the will she was about to sign expressed fully and satisfactorily her wishes, and she was in her right mind. Since that time I have visited her and Mr. Home on various occasions at her new lodgings, at Albert-terrace, and she never expressed any thing but the sincerest affection and respect for her adopted son. I have seen her go up to him when he was on the sofa, and kiss him with great affection. Her great desire seemed to be that he should recover his health and create a sensation in society by taking a more active and prominent part than his position had hitherto enabled him to do. The witness then went on to deny that he had ever influenced the plaintiff.

Dr. Hawksley, the other attesting witness, said that he had had ample opportunity of forming an estimate of the defendant's character, and it was only simple justice to him to say that he never found in him anything inconsistent with truth, honour, and perfect integrity. In consequence of a letter he received from the plaintiff he went to her lodgings for the purpose of attesting a will. The witness corroborated the evidence of Mr. Rudall.

Mr. R. Chambers deposed to Mrs. Lyon's conduct to the defendant Home being inconsistent with the idea that he exercised any influence over her. He also said that she appeared to entertain the greatest affection for him.

M. Eugene Rimmel, of the Strand, also spoke to the affectionate terms upon which the plaintiff always appeared to be with the defendant.

Mrs. Ellen Varley said that the plaintiff told her that the defendant had introduced her to a position in society which she had not before occupied, owing to his large circle of acquaintances.

Mrs. Nicol said that the plaintiff had often given the defendant money without solicitation from him.

Miss Elizabeth Fuller said that she had never heard any mother speak more affectionately of her son than did the plaintiff of the defendant. The plaintiff said that she had given the defendant money, quite irrespective of his being a spiritualist. The plaintiff was a good business woman.

Mr. Gerald Massey, of Ward's Hurst, Herts, in his affidavit, said, On the 28th of December, 1866, I met Mr. Home and Mrs. Lyon for the first time. It was at the house of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Carter Hall. Since that time I have seen a great deal of Mr. Home, and have never had the slightest reason to look upon him other than as a man of the most honourable character and kindest disposition; in fact, a gentleman whom I should judge to be quite incapable of any such business as has been laid to his charge. In company

with Mr. Home I called twice on Mrs. Lyon, and once I called alone and breakfasted with her, at her lodgings at Knightsbridge, and sat alone with her for several hours afterwards, and on each occasion she went more or less over the story of her meeting with Home, and told me her motives in adopting him as her son and heir. She said that since the death of her husband she had been alone in the world, having nobody to care for her. She had adopted Mr. Home as her child to have some one to love, some one to show her affection to. She had given him 30,000*l.* right off, she said, to make him independent of every body—independent even of herself, so that there should be nothing ambiguous in their relationship in the eyes of the world. I understood her also to say that she should make him the inheritor of the remainder of her wealth. She stated that she had sought out Mr. Home, and not Mr Home her. She had sought him out in the first instance, she observed, because she was a believer in what is called spiritualism. She had been a believer all her life, and accustomed to have visions from her childhood upwards. Of these she related several, being very anxious to impress me with her great natural gifts in this respect. Among other things I remember she told me that Mr. Home had been shown to her in one of her visions, and that she had recognized him immediately they met. Indeed, she said that her husband, before his death, had foretold her adopting a son. She stated the number of years she was to be after her husband's death and told me the time was up. She said she knew Mr. Home as the son of her adoption the moment she set eyes upon him. She was very open in speaking of what she had done for Mr. Home, and of what she intended yet to do. In regard to her gift of so large a sum, instead of making him depend on her for an allowance, she asked me if she had not done rightly. I replied that I thought she had done an uncommonly handsome thing. I inquired of Mrs. Lyon if she had acted from any thing said or done at any of Mr. Home's *séances*. She assured me most emphatically that she had not, and that nothing of the sort had taken place at their early interviews beyond her personal liking. She took constant delight in hearing Mr. Home relate his astonishment at her proposals, her gifts being so unsought and unexpected; and from what I saw of Mrs. Lyon I should take her to be one of the last persons in the world to be influenced by any will save her own. For example, she has taken a dislike to something done by Mr. Home's son, and nothing could soften her feeling against the child, or bend her resolute will, although this was very painful to Mr. Home. Her mind was made up, and there was nothing more to be said. From all that I saw of Mrs. Lyon's relationship to Mr. Home, I should say that her will was the dominant one. She made him do pretty much as she pleased, even to the going on errands for her, and carrying home trivial articles for her. She called him her child, and assuredly treated him as one. I saw him do very humiliating things, and put up with very strong displays of Mrs. Lyon's will. I once remarked to him, "I could not stand that for 30,000*l.* a year." His reply was, "Oh, you do not know mother; she likes to have her way, but she is kindness itself." I saw plainly enough that she liked to have her way, and I saw that she had it. My observation would lead me to assert that the charge of Mr. Home's power and ascendancy over Mrs. Lyon is the grossest fiction, and impudently absurd on the face of it. Why in the charge of "undue influence" by spirit means the falsehood to my mind stands already manifest, for Mrs. Lyon rated her own power of mediumship far above every thing shown by Mr. Home. So far did she carry this that I once told her I thought she was jealous of his alleged powers. But she soon demonstrated that she had no need

to be after such remarkable things as had occurred to her. She indeed even spoke with disapproval of Mr. Home's being sometimes in trances, and having *séances*, because she said it weakened his natural power. So far from being easily swayed I found that Mrs. Lyon would agree with nothing she did not like or that did not suit her view. On the other hand, so potent was Mrs. Lyon's power and ascendancy over Mr. Home that I foresaw it would in all likelihood be fatal to one so frail in health as Mr. Home, and I was one of the first, I think, to advise that he should make an effort to gain a little more personal freedom. I saw that he had a great difficulty in getting away from her, and that she was very jealous of him going any where without her. I am aware of more than one engagement he was not able to keep on this account. Mrs. Lyon was very ambitious of meeting with and being recognized by the class of people amongst whom *séances* like Mr. Home's excite the largest amount of curiosity. I mean persons of title and members of the aristocracy. Mr. Home's acquaintanceship with such is large, and I found that Mrs. Lyon was irrepressibly anxious to meet with Lady —, or go to the house of Lord —. She was greatly gratified with any notice shown to her by a titled lady. I speak of what I saw. And she was proportionately disappointed if it happened that Mr. Home was invited where she could not go. Mrs. Lyon expressed herself as being made very happy by what she had done, and she was very lavish in her marks of affection towards him. He was once speaking of some hardship he had undergone in early life, whereupon Mrs. Lyon embraced him, wept over him real tears, and said how glad she was to be the means of preventing any thing of that kind ever again occurring. She was at times excessively affectionate. A more cynical looker-on might have surmised a something too fond and fervent. I only thought it rather an ostentatious exhibition of late motherhood.

Several other witnesses spoke to the business capacity of the plaintiff and her affection for the defendant.

Dr. James Gully, a gentleman who had known the defendant for some years, in his affidavit said that in June, 1867, after Mr. Home left him and he heard the cruel measures Mrs. Lyon was taking against him, he wrote to ask her what he had done that she should so unjustly seek to insult him, and in reply to that letter she said, "You have only heard an invented story from beginning to end. I would explain it to you, but truth is best spoken, not written; for then if a person has judgment and common sense he can at once discern for himself truth from falsehood. You have your eyes shut by the medium of falsehood; mine have been opened by the medium of truth. I shall be glad to see you when you are in London, and am yours," &c. He had during the past seven years witnessed both in his own house and elsewhere, in the presence of Mr. Home, many curious occurrences, which he was unable to explain. Home had often refused money for *séances*, and he had known him refuse twenty guineas for a *séance*.

Catherine Berry said, I am acquainted with the plaintiff, and have been so since the year 1847. I should hardly call myself a spiritual medium. My hand is used by some unknown power, and the result is a drawing with a pencil or crayon, or oils, which I do not draw myself. I have had *séances* with plaintiff. I was present at a *séance* held at my house on the 7th of June. Plaintiff and Mr. Kent were present. Plaintiff asked all the questions. We were sitting round the table, placing our hands upon it, and in a few minutes

"tilts" came, not "raps." We are not rapping mediums. The "tilts" denote that there is a spirit waiting to communicate. Plaintiff asked whether it was the spirit of Mr. Lyon, her late husband. The table tilted three times. Plaintiff then asked questions relating entirely to the affairs of herself and defendant. The spirit denied having given authority for any money belonging to plaintiff to be given to Dan. The conversation lasted about forty minutes. The spirit then told us to move the table and make the room dark. In a few minutes a shower of sweet Williams were thrown on the table, and then four moss-roses, wrapped in tissue paper, were placed upon the table. I asked if they were for plaintiff, and the spirit answered one for her and the rest for yourself. I did not produce any of these things. I think I could swear that no mortal did. In fact I could swear so. The witness then spoke of a *séance* which she had in the presence of the plaintiff on the 14th of June, when similar remarkable manifestations occurred, but on that occasion the spirit was heard to walk heavily about the room. The plaintiff asked it the questions. She asked the spirit whether it approved of what she was doing, and the answer was, "Yes; go to law, and be firm." She then asked whether going to law would get her out of the difficulty, and the answer was "Doubtful." The plaintiff also asked the spirit whether he approved of her lawyer, but the spirit judiciously refrained from answering.

Mrs. Hall said that the defendant had given his *séances* without payment, that he was an honourable man, and that the plaintiff always regarded him with the greatest affection. The plaintiff said that before she had seen the defendant the spirit of her husband had told her that she should have a son.

Mr. S. C. Hall said the plaintiff asked him what would make Home comfortable, and he said 300*l.* a year. The plaintiff said she had determined to give him 500*l.* a year at least. He (witness) warned her of what the world would say, and she replied that she had thought of that. She said also that she had no one in the world in whom she took an interest, and she determined to give him the money in question. Witness asked her not to act in haste in such a matter, and she replied that she had fully considered it.

Mr. Home, the defendant, was then cross-examined by Mr. James. He said, I have had peculiar visions for many years.

Mr. James.—How are the communications made between the medium and the spiritual world? I do not know.—Have you had such communications? Yes.—And how have they manifested themselves, have you spoken to the spirits? Yes.—How do the sounds indicate that they proceed from the spirit? Well, we take that for granted; there is an operator at the end of the telegraph wire; we know there is intelligence there.—How do the sounds form words? The alphabet is repeated, and when the right letter is spoken the spirit gives a knock.—How do the knocks signify negative and affirmative? One knock signifies "Yes," and three "No," but you can arrange that as you please. The spirit is an intelligent being.—How do you know what spirit it is? They usually spell their names.—Supposing I wanted to consult with the spirit of a disembodied person, what course would you pursue? If I knew you came for that purpose I would not receive you unless you were introduced by a friend.—What course would you adopt supposing I was introduced by a friend? I should do nothing. The spirit would manifest itself if it chose. I have no power.—In what way would the spirit make itself known to me? It would make itself known by sounds.—Then if I proceeded to ask questions the alphabet

would be produced? That I do not know.—The alphabet would be produced and said by degrees, and the communication would be spelt out? Yes.—Have you been subjected yourself to physical experiments by the spirits? Yes.—Have you been moved bodily—floated in the air by the spirits? Yes, but I must insist on asserting that I am not the only person to whom that has occurred.—And tables and chairs have been moved in violation of the ordinary rules of gravity? Yes.—Do you know of any good having resulted from this? Yes, in convincing persons of the immortality of the soul.—I do not see how your floating in the air would convince persons of the immortality of the soul. I don't say that alone would, but it is the intelligence conveyed with it.—Have you ever known of any useful results of these practical jokes? From these practical jokes—No, but that is only one side of the question.—Have you ever been the medium of giving useful information? Yes, on some occasions. They don't usually interfere with the affairs of the earth.—Did you ever know them the means of prediction? Yes.—You have never known them to give information as to stockjobbing? No.—As to health? Yes.—As to conduct towards relatives? Well, I don't know. Well, yes, they usually try to hatch up feuds.—There are false, or lying spirits? Yes, there are all kinds; as men are on earth.—Then a person consulting a spirit is liable to be deceived? Yes.—Then how is one to know whether the spirit is speaking truth or falsehood? We have to exercise our common sense.—Are you in possession of this gift at the present moment? I suppose I am.—Do you remember when was the last time you had a manifestation? I have had two or three during the past few weeks. I do not remember what occurred at them. I have a very bad memory.—Do you remember what occurred whilst you were entranced? No, I do not.

Cross-examination continued.—On one occasion the spirits rapped on my umbrella, "This is God's church, the birds are His choristers, and the sky His sculptured walls." The identity of the spirit is proved in various ways. For instance, by the mode of expression used, by their revealing things which I could not otherwise have known.

Mr. James.—I want to know how you would ascertain the identity of a particular spirit? Only by patient observation, unless I see it.—And when you see it, how do you tell? By the dress and general appearance.—Then there is the ghost or spirit of the dress as well? Yes, for the first once or twice.

Cross-examination continued.—I have not seen a spirit for some time. I have had too many material things to think about.

Mr. James.—Which was the last spirit you saw? I would rather not say.—How did you communicate with it? The question was asked by a person who was with me, who was also a medium.

Cross-examination continued.—I have never asked a spirit any question with reference to this suit. At the time I first met the plaintiff I was secretary to the Spiritual Athenæum, in Sloane-street. I was exceedingly poor, only receiving pay from the society. I have not been brought up to any profession or trade.

Mr. James.—You say you gave the plaintiff rank and position? I do.—What was it? Being introduced to my large circle of acquaintances, literary and otherwise.—Then the rank and position you gave her were yours? No; I have no rank or position; it was that of my friends.

Cross-examination continued.—I was only secretary of the society for two months. I have travelled a great deal; visited the Courts, and moved in high circles. My expenses were usually paid by my friends, or from money I made

by readings. I had some money with my wife, and some settled upon me by a friend. I have had many gifts by friends; many anonymous and considerable gifts. I married in 1858. The income of my wife was sufficient for me to live comfortably upon; but it has been suspended for a time owing to a technical legal difficulty. I believe the first spiritual powers appeared to me when I was six months old; but the first external manifestation that I knew any thing of was developed in 1850. At first I had no means of interpreting the sounds. The alphabet was given to me by a clergyman in America. I did seek to influence plaintiff in the disposition of her property. I endeavoured to influence her against the course she was following, but I do not say that in my heart I was not glad. I still adhere to the statement that the position was forced upon me by the plaintiff. I deny the statement of Mrs. Fellows with reference to what took place in February. The plaintiff did not say, "Oh, my darling, let me see you!" and I did not say, "Don't interrupt me." It is untrue that Mrs. Fellows said, "Let us have a manifestation," and that I replied I had a bad headache. I recollect the pocket-handkerchief being knotted. That was on the 8th of October last. Mrs. Lyon was sitting at the table, and she held up her handkerchief and said, "Look what has occurred!" I asked her whether she had not done it to remind herself of something, and she replied in the negative. On the 7th of October, as I was about to leave the house, I heard a knocking, and the following was rapped out, "Do not say the light of other days has fled. I, Charles, am with you." I did not know the name of her husband at that time. All that has been stated by Mrs. Key with reference to what she heard is perfectly false. What has been stated by Mr. Wilkinson with reference to what took place when the will was made is true. I never said, in answer to a request that there should be a manifestation, "I cannot do it, mother; there is something in Mrs. Fellows' presence." The defendant then proceeded to deny the statements contained in Mrs. Pepper's affidavit.

Mr. James then read a letter from the defendant to a person named Bradshaw, stating, "Should the information you speak of be correct, I will place at your disposal the sum of 300*l.* after my suit is concluded. I can only do this as you are not a witness, and are outside the cause."

The defendant then went into a history of the letter, stating that it resulted from an anonymous communication he received, which from the first he knew was a trap. He wrote the letter in order that it might be produced in court.

Re-examined by Mr. Matthews.—I have been the guest of crowned heads, and have resided at the Emperor of Russia's palace. I have also been a guest of the Emperor of the French. I never claimed to have the power to produce the manifestation, nor have I the slightest belief that I have the power to do so. There are mediums besides myself. They are always persons of nervous temperament. I know mediums who cannot for a moment be suspected of making a profit out of the manifestations. I saw manifestations in Mr. Jenkin's house. I never consulted spirits with regard to his pecuniary affairs, nor have I professed to do so for other people. I have known Dr. and Miss Gully for many years, and had no motive for deceiving them. Miss Gully was with me at the time the raps came on the umbrella, and she spelt out some of the words. At the last manifestation Mr. Ellis, M.A., of Oxford, was present; that was about a fortnight ago, at Mr. Jenkin's house. At the time Mrs. Lyon gave me the money I had a father, a sister, two aged aunts, and my child dependent upon me. Nobody made money out of the Spiritual Athenaeum; on the contrary, the

members lost by it. It was only a place of meeting for the members. When the will was executed I was in Mrs. Lyon's bedroom. I was there at her request, and she asked me to go into the other room when the will was made. Before the will was executed I never spoke to Mr. Wilkinson about it. Nor have I had any communication with Mr. Wilkinson about his other business with Mrs. Lyon. I had two meetings with Mrs. Bradshaw (the person who sent the anonymous letter). She lived at Albert-terrace, in the same house with Mrs. Lyon. When I had an interview with Mrs. Bradshaw I had a witness present.

Mr. Matthews proceeded to comment on the case for the defendant. He remarked on the plaintiff's demeanour in the witness-box, by which she had shown herself a good woman of business and of singular vigour and shrewdness of understanding, and thus unlikely to have been under the extraordinary influence alleged. He dwelt upon the improbability of the plaintiff's story, and read the letter of the 10th of October from the plaintiff to the defendant, in which she wrote, "I have a desire to render you *independent* of the world, and having *ample* means for the purpose, without abstracting from any needs or *comforts* of my own, I have the greatest satisfaction in now presenting you with, and as an *entirely* FREE GIFT from me, the sum of 24,000*l.*" The plaintiff, in her cross-examination, at first persisted in denying all recollection of the letter, and it was not until it was actually put into her hands she admitted that she had written such a letter, and that it was in her handwriting. Then, all at once, she remembered all about it, how she wrote it from a copy, how, as soon as she had copied the draft, the draft was immediately torn up. What reliance was to be placed upon such testimony? In her answer, speaking of this letter, she said that the draft from which it was copied was destroyed with other business papers on a subsequent occasion, in accordance with the supposed commands of her husband's spirit. What answer, again, could she give to the questions with which she was pressed as to the underscorings in the letter? She evaded the question, and would give no answer. Feeling, with natural shrewdness, the pinch of her case upon this point, she was obliged to resort to shifts, prevaricating and cunning suggestions to evade the difficulty. Her testimony as to all the circumstances attending this letter was full of contradictions. It was impossible to read her letters and doubt the existence of her affection for the defendant.

Mr. Fitzroy Kelly followed on the same side.

Mr. James then replied, and in the ensuing term the Vice-Chancellor delivered judgment in this suit, which, he stated, had for its object the setting aside of a gift by the plaintiff to the defendant Home absolutely of a sum of 30,000*l.* stock, and the settlement upon him of a further sum of 30,000*l.* His honour first read a statement, or narrative, of the facts of the case, and referred to the lonely position of the plaintiff, who was a widow and childless when the occurrences material to the case took place, and who lived in cheap lodgings, without society or friends capable of advising her. He then read considerable extracts from the bill and answer and evidence in the suit, illustrative of the acquaintanceship and position of the plaintiff and defendant, and referred specially to the denial in the defendant's answer that he had ever caused any spiritual manifestations when alone with the plaintiff, and his statement that if any such had occurred they were occasioned by the plaintiff. As to this denial and statement, his honour read extracts from manuscript books in the plaintiff's handwriting containing accounts of manifestations—such as a handkerchief

supposed to be knotted by the husband's spirit. After reading extracts from Mr. Wilkinson, the solicitor's answer, his honour said that it appeared that nearly all who had made affidavits in support of the defendant's case were spiritualists, and contradicted the plaintiff in many particulars, showing what the conduct and statements of the plaintiff were when they were present. Some of the evidence went to show that the plaintiff treated the manifestations in conversing about them with levity, and in a joking manner. His honour then said that he would refer to passages of the defendant's cross-examination and other evidence. He must, however, state that a comparison of the statements in the plaintiff's affidavits with the cross-examination and Mr. Wilkinson's evidence showed that no reliance could be placed on the plaintiff's statements, uncorroborated by other evidence. Nevertheless, his honour did not hesitate to say that he totally disbelieved the defendant's allegation that she was turned against him in consequence of his refusing to respond to her affection. If this were true it would not assist the defendant's case. But every letter, act, and communication in the case disproved and were inconsistent with this. In approaching the substantial and effective part of his judgment his honour said that he had to consider, first, the merits of the case, and, secondly, the law applicable to it. As to the first, he could have wished the bill so framed as to contain the substance of the evidence and manuscript books relied on to support it; still it could not be said that each party had not had fair notice of all the issues that were to be raised. The question here was, whether two gifts, each supported by irrevocable deeds, were or were not to be upheld; on this the principles of the Court were clear, as expressed in the judgment of Lord Eldon, in *Hatch v. Hatch*, and Lord Cottenham, in *Dent v. Millett*. These principles were that in such relationships as guardian and ward, attorney and client, medical man and patient, where undue influence was easy of exercise, the spontaneity of gifts must be shown by the clearest evidence. On considering the facts of this case it was clear from the outset that the plaintiff was passionately attached to her dead husband, and that she expected to meet him again in the year in which the events in question took place. She had taken to reading spiritualistic works, and had become a believer in their theories. She was superstitious, and open to the influence of visions, one of which—that of a golden-haired boy, who was to be her son—had had the greatest effect upon her. With her mind well saturated with these things, she made overtures for acquaintance with Home. His honour then detailed the events following her first knowledge of him, and the mode in which the gifts were made. On the defendant Home lay the onus of showing that what she did was the result of her pure volition uninfluenced by him. The defendant denied that he had occasioned any spiritual manifestations at their interviews. But Mrs. Fellows' evidence showed that much more had taken place in the shape of manifestations than he was willing to admit. In short, when the antecedents of both parties, the facts, letters, and actions proved in the case, were considered, it was clear that the transactions were such as should be jealously watched. It was true that the plaintiff for several months was obstinately desirous of supporting the gifts, owing, amongst other causes, partly to fear lest her sanity should be questioned, and his honour was therefore satisfied that the statements that spiritualism had not influenced her mind were contrary to the fact. It was true that the plaintiff had knowledge of business, but this was limited as compared with the defendant's. It was urged that she had independent advice. But it must be borne in mind that the

defendant was in constant communication with her; that she feared the interference of her husband's relatives; that she thought her sanity might be questioned; and that no power of revocation was contained in the deeds, or even suggested to her. All that was done in the way of advice and warning was apparently done more by way of caution against what others might do than of protection of the plaintiff. It was most important that no suggestion of a power of revocation or of the advisability of communicating with the husband's relatives had been made. As before stated, the onus of proving that no influence had been exercised lay on the defendant. From the reasons, facts, and evidence before referred to, he must hold that the defendant had not made out a case in support of the gifts. There must, therefore, be the usual declaration setting aside the gifts as fraudulent and void, a re-transfer and re-assignment of the property must be directed, with usual accounts, by the defendant. Under the circumstances of the case he should not order the defendant to pay more than his own costs. As to the costs of the defendant Wilkinson, the trustee, his answer and evidence had been so enormously increased in length and expense by the charges made against him by the plaintiff, whose statements were so perverse and untrue, that the Court felt itself seriously embarrassed by them; and, therefore, should direct his costs to be paid by the plaintiff. His honour then stated that, knowing nothing of spiritualism beyond what had appeared in the course of the suit, he could not, nor was it his duty to, express his opinion on the merits of the belief. It was not for him to say what might or might not be the effect of peculiar nervous organizations in inducing a belief that certain phenomena were the result of spiritual agency. Nevertheless, the views of the defendant on this matter tended to give him an influence, and his honour felt compelled to say that the system was a most mischievous one, and well calculated on the one hand to control the believers in it and to assist the plans of the needy and designing.

III.

PROSECUTION OF MR. EYRE.

CHARGE OF MR. JUSTICE BLACKBURN.

THE case of Mr. Eyre, Ex-Governor of Jamaica, came before the Court of Queen's Bench upon a prosecution for high crimes and misdemeanours, in acts of alleged abuse and oppression under colour of execution of his office as Governor of the island.

Mr. Justice Blackburn delivered the following charge to the grand jury:—In the year 1865 Mr. Eyre was Governor of Jamaica, and in October of that year, on the breaking out of an insurrection, Mr. Eyre, as Governor, and in order to put it down, took steps into the legality of which we are now to inquire. It is not disputed that he did, with the assent of his counsel, proclaim martial law, and put it in force; in this sense I mean that he not only caused troops to act in the proclaimed district to put down the insurrection and to suppress armed resistance, but he also caused martial law to be executed in the sense of summary proceedings, superseding the common law; and that a number of persons were tried by this summary process and subjected to severe punishments; and further, that he caused this to be done for a period of thirty days. The ques-

tion is, whether in doing these things he did anything for which he ought to be criminally responsible. Now the law upon the subject is of great importance, and when I have explained it to you it will be for you to determine the questions of fact which arise upon it. The prosecution is not under the First Colonial Governors' Act of William III., but under the Act of the 42nd of George III., c. 85, which enacted in substance that if any governor of a colony, or any military officer holding any station in a colony should be guilty of any crime or offence in the exercise or execution of his office, or under colour of it, he shall be liable to be tried here. There is no question that Mr. Eyre did what was done by him as Governor of Jamaica, and that if any of the things he did are crimes or offences they were done in execution or under colour of his office. So the question comes to be, What are the "crimes and misdemeanours and offences" which can be committed, what is the rule or test of the criminal responsibility which may be incurred by a governor when acting, as Mr. Eyre undoubtedly was, as governor, and for the purpose of putting an end to an insurrection?—a question on which it is of great importance that the law should be distinctly laid down. For it is of great importance that it should be known when a governor in such a position can be deemed to have so far exceeded his duty as to be criminally responsible. Upon that question there can be no doubt that the legal duty, and therefore the legal responsibility, of persons in such a position varies very much according to their powers or functions, either by the common law or by any particular statutes. The powers of a governor of a colony are far more extensive, for instance, than those of the lord-lieutenant of a county or the mayor of a borough in England, when a riot or insurrection has broken out, and consequently the things he would be authorized to do, and which he might be blamable if he did not do, would greatly differ. But the principle on which the doctrine rests is the same; the officer is bound to exercise the powers which the law gives him in the manner which under the circumstances would be right, and if he fails in something he ought to do, or which the circumstances render it his duty to do, and he neglects his duty to such an extent as to amount to criminal negligence, then he will be criminally responsible. All this was considered thirty years ago in the case of the Mayor of Bristol, when riots broke out there, which for want of proper steps taken to put them down continued three days, and a great part of Bristol was burnt down. The Government thought that the Mayor was responsible for not having done his duty as Mayor in putting down the riots, and he was therefore prosecuted. That case was the converse of the present. Here the charge against Mr. Eyre is that he exceeded his duty, and did so much more than he ought to have done, that he is criminally responsible; there the charge was that the mayor failed in his duty, and did not do enough. The two questions are correlative, and the law laid down in that case on a trial at Bar by Mr. Justice Little-
dale, in the name of the Court, affords useful guidance in laying down the principle applicable in the present case. The learned Judge said that a party entrusted with the duty of putting down a riot, whether by virtue of an office of his own seeking (as in the ordinary case of a magistrate), or imposed upon him (as that of a constable), is bound to hit the exact line between excess and failure of duty, and that the difficulty of so doing, though it might be some ground for a lenient consideration of his conduct on the part of the jury, was no legal defence to a charge like the present. Nor could a party so charged excuse himself on the mere ground of honest intention. He might omit acting to the extent of his duty from a perfectly good feeling, and that might be considered in appor-

tioning punishment; but the question for the jury must be—whether or not he had done what his duty in point of law required. The subject of inquiry therefore in that case would be—whether the defendant had done all that he knew was in his power to suppress the riots; that could reasonably be expected from a man of honesty and of ordinary prudence, firmness, and activity under the circumstances in which he was placed. Honesty of intention, though not of itself sufficient to exculpate, would form an ingredient in the case to be taken into consideration. The learned Judge then stated as the two points on which the inquiry would turn, whether the defendant used those means which the law requires to assemble a sufficient force for suppressing the riot and preventing the mischief which occurred; and, secondly, whether he had made use of the force which was obtained; and also of his own personal exertion to prevent mischief as might reasonably have been expected from a firm and honest man. ("The King v. Pinney," 3, Barnwall and Adolphus, "King's Bench Reports," p. 958.) The amount of neglect of duty which would make the party criminally responsible cannot be strictly defined. It is not every little failure to perform the duty which would make him criminally responsible. A great failure of duty would. The line may be hard to draw, but it must be drawn in each case by the jury, and they are to say whether they think there was such a failure of duty as to be criminal. That was the law as laid down by this Court in that case. In the present case—where the charge is that Mr. Eyre was guilty of criminal excess—the principle is very much the same, or is the complement of what was then laid down. It seems to me that if the officer does some act altogether beyond his power, so that it never could under any circumstances have been his duty to do it, he would be responsible according to the quality of the act, even though doing it was the salvation of the country. It may be a ground for legislation or for an Act of Indemnity, but there would be no answer to a criminal prosecution. That is in a case of something wholly beyond his power to do. But when it is something which in a possible state of circumstances he would be authorized to do, and which even in an extreme case he might be punishable for not doing, then the case becomes very different. The honesty of intention in such a case is of importance, for if it be shown that he was acting under colour of his office, from an indirect motive, no doubt he would be guilty of an offence; and even if he were imperfectly honest that might not conclusively decide the question. The officer is bound under such circumstances to use ordinary firmness and judgment and moderation; and in such a case the jury have to determine upon the evidence—(1) whether the circumstances were in fact such that what was done really was an excess of duty; (2) whether a person in his position, and having his information and his state of knowledge and belief, and in the exercise of ordinary judgment and firmness and moderation, must have perceived that it was an excess. Much allowance must be made for a person in such a position; but not too much. The question is whether in the particular case there was so much excess as to be criminal excess. The questions then are (1), whether the acts done by Mr. Eyre were entirely beyond his legal power and competence to do, and such as he never could have had the right or power to do at all? If so, then the acts were illegal, and then, though there may have been ground for applying for the mercy of the Crown or to the Legislature for an Act of Indemnity; and though the acts may have been done with the most honest intention, and may even have been beneficial, there would be no answer to a criminal prosecution. But then, secondly, if what he did were acts which he had in his legal power and

competence to do, and which under proper circumstances he would be bound to do, and for not doing which in certain such circumstances if mischief followed he might be punishable for not doing, then, in that case, the question is, (1) whether the circumstances were such that what he did was in excess: (2) under the circumstances, as they appeared to him—putting yourselves as far as possible in his place, and looking not merely to what the facts were, but what they appeared to him to be—under such circumstances, would a reasonable man, taking into account what he heard or believed, what he would naturally think, supposing he brought, as he was bound to bring, reasonable firmness and moderation to the discharge of his duty—that duty being not only to suppress the rebellion, but also to show a reasonable regard to the rights of individuals, and not to oppress or ill-treat them—would such a man, under such circumstances, have seen and known that he was committing excess? That is a question entirely for you. In a word, was there excess on his part to such an extent as to make him criminally liable? It is necessary now to inquire what were the limits of his power as Governor under such circumstances. What could he do? What had he by law the power of doing? Now that must in the main depend upon the law of Jamaica, a question really and practically for me. Now in the first place, in the case of a colony settled by subjects from this country, they carry with them so much of the law of England as is applicable—that is, they lose no privileges by going out there. In the case of colonies acquired by conquest the foreign law continues until altered, and thus we have the Spanish law in Trinidad, the Dutch law in Demerara, and the French law in the Mauritius, the Crown having the power to alter the law and substitute the English law. In the case of Jamaica there have been some doubts. When Oliver Cromwell took the island the Spaniards had possession of it; but in the time of Charles II., at all events, there was a charter proclaiming the English law, and that law, no doubt, was then in force—that is, the law of England as it was then in force in this country. Then came a further question of great importance. If the laws were to remain unaltered there would be great inconvenience, and therefore it is the prerogative of the Crown to grant to the colony a legislative power to alter the laws, or make new laws to bind the colony. I am surprised to find that any doubt has been thrown upon this, and that it has been supposed that the Colonial Legislature could not alter the law at all, and could not make an Act which should interfere with or alter the privileges of English subjects. No one can surely entertain a doubt upon that point. It was so laid down by the Privy Council in an appeal from the island of Jamaica when the House of Assembly was charged with having done what was illegal, and claimed the power of the English House of Commons to commit for contempt. In that case the late Mr. Baron Parke, delivering judgment, said, having alluded to the grant of a Legislative Assembly to the colony, “That act of the supreme governing authority in England constitutes a Legislative Body in Jamaica, and it gives that body the power, subordinate, no doubt, to that of the Parliament of Great Britain, and subject to its control, if it chooses to exercise it, to enact laws which will bind all the inhabitants of Jamaica and its dependencies. This Assembly is not like a corporation which has a power to make by-laws for the carrying into effect the purpose for which it was established, but it is the supreme Legislative Assembly of the island, authorized to make laws for it with the sanction of the Sovereign” (“*Beaumont v. Barrett*,” Moore’s Privy Council Cases). And that view of the law was afterwards with great deliberation confirmed, in another appeal case

before the Privy Council (an appeal from Newfoundland), in which the Judges present were Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Brougham, Lord Denman, Lord Abinger, Lord Campbell, Lord Cottenham, Mr. Baron Parke, and Dr. Lushington, and, although they differed from the former decision as to the power of the House of Assembly to commit for contempt, they laid down the same law as to its legislative power to make new laws:—"Newfoundland is a settled, not a conquered colony, and to such a colony there is no doubt that the settlers from the mother country carried with them such portion of its common and statute law as was applicable to their new situation, and also the rights and immunities of British subjects. Their descendants have, on the other hand, the same laws and the same rights, unless they have been altered by Parliament. And, on the other hand, the Crown possesses the same prerogatives and the same powers of Government that it does over its other subjects" ("Keeley v. Carson," 4 Moore's Privy Council Cases, 85). Now I have no doubt whatever that this is the law, and although in a civil case it may be open to a party to question it if he pleases and carry the question to the House of Lords, insisting that all these great authorities were in error, and maintaining that a governor or other person directing or acting in the execution of martial law under a colonial Act has no legal justification, yet in a criminal court it is impossible to say that you can ever treat a party as criminal and punishable who has merely acted in obedience to a local statute. It would be perfectly monstrous to say that he was to take upon himself to determine what law is or is not binding upon him, and to say that he would not obey this or that law because he deemed it unconstitutional. Such a power is given to the Supreme Court of America, but there is no such power known in our law or Constitution, and it is impossible to say that when a colonial governor carried out the law of the colony he should be criminally punishable for it. Therefore we must start on an inquiry into the law with this position—that Mr. Eyre, as Governor, had not only those powers which in the reign of Charles II. the Crown had the prerogative to exercise (for he, as Governor, would have the same powers as the Crown), but also those powers which he might exercise by any Acts of the colonial Legislature. This is a position of immense importance in the present case, and I should be wrong in leaving you in any doubt that such is the law. Then we come to two questions which arise here:—1. What was the power of the Crown by its prerogative at common law in the time of Charles II. as to proclaiming martial law? and 2, to what extent have the Acts or the colonial Legislature given this or any larger power? As to the second question, the construction of the colonial statutes must a good deal depend upon what in the time of Charles II. was supposed to be the law, and therefore to that extent it is necessary to inquire into the prerogative of the Crown in the time of Charles II. Further than that it is not necessary to inquire into that matter, except, indeed, so far as it might be necessary to consider whether the prerogative power as it then existed would have justified such extensive measures as were taken in the present case, as to which I do not think that it would; but into that it is not necessary to enter further here. Now you know that from Magna Charta to the Revolution it was laid down as the general law of the land that a subject could not be punished except in due course of law on trial by jury. That was the general law, but from the earliest times this also was laid down as law—that in time of invasion or insurrection it is the duty of good subjects, in obedience to the officers of the Crown, to resist the invaders or insurgents, and for the purpose of resisting them the Executive could call out

an army in order to resist the enemy. In modern times this is of little consequence, because we have under the *Mutiny Acts* and the *Militia Acts* an armed force raised and subject to the control of law; but in old times, when there were often insurrections of the barons or of a tumultuous people—in those turbulent times there was no regular army, and when there was insurrection those officers who were entrusted with “commissions of array” had to raise an army and fight the enemies of the Crown. Now an armed force merely subject to the ordinary forms of law would not be endurable, and, accordingly, there was a prerogative of the Crown, to a certain extent recognized by law, that in time of war or rebellion, when an armed force was raised by the Crown, it should be kept in order by a more summary kind of justice than the slow process of the common law; and in that sense arose what was called “martial law,” and of which Lord Hale said that it was rather indulged, as the absence of all law, and extended to the armed force either of the Crown or the enemy. To that extent the Crown had the power to exercise martial law in time of war; but, further, in such circumstances, there would be anarchy unless there was something to keep the people in order. Suppose, for instance, an invading army encamped at Dover, and an English army ranged on the other side, it is obvious that ordinary criminal justice could not go on, and that unless justice was administered in some other way there would be lawless anarchy. On that ground the Crown claimed the prerogative of exercising this martial law against the insurgents during the insurrection and for a short time afterwards—that is, claimed the power of summary punishment, even by execution of the insurgents, as examples to others, and in order to deter others from following their course, and thus to check the progress of the rebellion. To what extent the Crown could do that has never yet been decided. But the Crown did, in fact, exercise it, and it frequently came into operation. It was put in force a good deal under Elizabeth in time of insurrection, and a great many summary executions occurred, which, according to our modern notions, would be deemed terribly oppressive. Her successor was weaker and roused opposition, and at the beginning of the next reign, of Charles I., the Crown had issued commissions in time of peace, described in the *Petition of Right*, giving power to “proceed according to the summary justice of martial law,” not only against soldiers, but “all other dissolute persons,” not only for mutiny, but for any felony or other offence, “and by such summary order as is agreeable to martial law, and as is used in armies in time of war, to cause them to be executed according to martial law.” That is, the power to proclaim martial law was claimed and exercised in time of peace. And this was opposed and protested against in the *Petition of Right*, reciting that such commission had been issued, and declaring that “such commissions as aforesaid” should no longer be issued. That is to say, commissions of martial law in time of peace. The Legislature, therefore, did not in terms say that there should not be martial law in time of war. It does not follow that it is to be deemed to have sanctioned it. Great statesmen as well as lawyers were then in power, and they had reasons of their own for not raising that question. They did not therefore say that martial law was illegal in time of war, because their having attacked the Crown on that point would have given the Crown an advantage. They therefore, as wise statesmen, did not raise that point. It would therefore be an error to say that, because the *Petition of Right* did not condemn martial law, therefore it sanctioned it. Still it is true that the *Petition of Right* did not condemn it. And there has never been since that time any case in

which it was necessary judicially to consider the extent or the limits of that power or prerogative of the Crown in war. Thus much we may say, that in time of peace the Crown had no such power. Lord Hale touches upon the question wisely and cautiously in several of his works. The Crown, he says, in one work, has this prerogative "during rebellion, but not after." Then, in his "*History of the Common Law*," he says that it is, as it were, the absence of law, indulged rather than allowed, and only to the King's army, or they of the opposite army—that is, the enemy. Then, in his "*Pleas of the Crown*," he says that the prerogative of martial law exists in time of war, and that, regularly, this is when the courts of law are closed. Thus cautiously he expresses himself upon the subject, and I think it may be said that the extent of it is in doubt. But thus much is clear,—that the prerogative in such case is not of that unbounded nature which some have supposed, and it is limited to cases of necessity. And it cannot be doubted that when Mr. Eyre, as Colonial Governor, kept it up for thirty days, when armed resistance had ceased in the first day or two, and it was quite possible to try the prisoners by the regular tribunals, he exceeded what would have been authorized by the most extended view of the prerogative of the Crown. Therefore, if it had stood solely on the power of the Governor by the common law prerogative of the Crown, I am afraid I should have been obliged to tell you that you were bound to find a true bill, whatever reason there may have been for a bill of indemnity. But then the law by no means remains in that state. It has been completely altered by the colonial statutes, which gave an immensely extended power to the Governor, beyond what was ever possessed by the Crown, except, as in Ireland, by statute. The first Jamaica statute on the subject was that of the 33rd of Charles II., when the Crown at common law had clearly no power to declare martial law in time of peace, but on the other hand claimed it in time of rebellion or war; and the Jamaica colonists were well aware of this, and of course had every disposition to protect themselves from arbitrary power; but on the other hand they knew that theirs was a slave colony liable to insurrection, and also a colony exposed to hostile attacks from the Spaniards; and therefore they passed the Act that on every appearance of danger the Governor in Council might proclaim the "articles of war." The Act goes on to declare that as soon as the common law revives and is in force, the negroes and servants so employed shall be discharged, and "to the end it may be known when the martial law ceaseth and the common law taketh its place," it was declared that "upon discharging the soldiers from their arms the martial law ceaseth, and the common law taketh its place" (33 Charles II. Jamaica Statutes, c. 21, s. 7.) Looking at these words, there can be no doubt what the Act meant. There can be no doubt that it did not mean merely providing a Mutiny Act (which had been done already), but that it meant to enact the power of declaring martial law in the sense in question—that is to say, that which the Petition of Right had declared should not be allowed in time of peace, and which was not condemned in time of war—viz. to supersede the common law and substitute the summary proceedings of military law; not, of course, a power arbitrarily to put men to death without cause, but to supersede the ordinary processes of law, and to try men by summary process, in order that they might be summarily tried and convicted and punished, with a view to check the progress of rebellion. After this statute many other Acts passed relating to the militia, and then came, so lately as the year 1845, the Act 9th of Victoria, which repeals the old statute, and enacts that the Council of War should consist of the Governor and all the chief functionaries in the island—the Chief Justice, the Commander-in-Chief,

the Attorney-General, &c.—and then it proceeds to provide that as on appearance of public danger it may be necessary to proclaim martial law, but that it is the greatest of evils—that therefore it should not be proclaimed without the assent of the Council, nor should it be in force for more than thirty days, unless extended with the same assent. Now what was the Act in force when Mr. Eyre acted; and what power did it give him? There can be no doubt that the original Act was intended to give the power of declaring martial law in the fullest sense—that is, in the sense of superseding or suspending the common law. There is nothing in any of the intermediate Acts to affect this, and there have been insurrections when things were done which could not have been justified unless martial law to that extent existed. It has been suggested that such measures were justified upon the notion that the negro was a slave and not a freeman, and had no legal rights. But there was an occasion within our own memory when such things were done—the insurrection of 1830. The Anti-Slavery Society was then in full vitality, and its most illustrious champions were then in full vigour—such men as Brougham and Lushington and Buxton—and if they had understood that these things were justified on any such notion we should surely have heard of it; but it was never supposed, and I think that looking at the terms of these Acts, and especially the words describing martial law as the greatest of evils, it cannot be doubted, that the Legislature meant to allow martial law in the sense of suspending the common law, and substituting the summary proceedings of military law. They put two checks upon it—first, that it should not be proclaimed but with the assent of the Council; next, that it should not be in force beyond thirty days without that assent. Gentleman, I have now nearly concluded what I have to say to you on the law of the case; and it comes to this:—Under the Colonial Act Mr. Eyre had power, in case of apprehended danger, to proclaim martial law in the sense of suspending the common law, and enabling matters to be tried by summary procedure “such as in armies in time of war.” That is not an arbitrary power, but a power, without technical or formal rules, to do substantial justice in a summary way. That power he had to exercise on a proper occasion. Consequently, if there was such a state of things that a man of reasonable firmness would have felt that he ought to have done it, then he had the power to do it; and if he had not, under such circumstances, done it, and mischief had ensued, he would have been punishable for not doing it. Then comes the question—putting yourselves into the position in which he then was—knowing what he did, and believing what he did—was he culpable in continuing it for thirty days? That is to say, in allowing it to run on, for he might have put a stop to it before the end of that period. That he could proclaim martial law there is no doubt; in such a case he would have been blamable if he had not done so. Was he culpable in not stopping it? That depends upon the facts as they would appear to him at the time. When we look at the terms of the Colonial Act, we see that it was plainly intended that the summary power and jurisdiction should be continued as long as necessary to prevent insurrection, but no longer. When there is such danger that if martial law is not exercised in this way the rebellion may spread, and the colony may be destroyed—then it might be so exercised. Then comes the great question—had he, in fact, reasonable grounds for continuing it? That is, to make it right to continue it. Or did he in fact continue it to such an extent, and with such an excess, as that a man of reasonable moderation and firmness would have known that he should not have done it? That is a question of fact for you. The law has been stated to you. There is, however, a

further question. It arises thus :—When martial law was in force in a particular district Mr. Eyre caused five or six persons to be seized out of that district and to be carried into it to be tried for alleged offences there, and of these one (Gordon) was so tried, and convicted and executed. Two others (Phillips and Morris) were, with or without trial, flogged. The others were not so tried, but were detained in custody after the expiration of martial law, and then prosecuted before the ordinary tribunal, and one convicted and the others acquitted. Then arises the question whether, looking at these acts, this could be justifiable. I have considered that point carefully, and have come to the conclusion that, looking at what martial law was, it might under proper circumstances be justifiable. It is a great principle that the “trial of crime is local,” and that offences are to be tried where they are alleged to have been committed. The exceptions to this rule are by particular statutes; as, for instance, the statute under which you are trying here matters which occurred in Jamaica. But the general case is that the trial of crime is local, and that therefore a party is sent for trial to the place where the offence is charged to have been committed. No doubt, in the case of martial law, one of the reasons for it, the impracticability of trial by ordinary law, would not apply when the arrest was out of the district where the rebellion was going on. But then the Legislature contended that there should be the power of summary trial, in order that parties might thus be more quickly tried, with a view to the effect of this in stopping the progress of insurrection. And so, if that was really the object, it might be justifiable, or, at all events, not criminal, though it might be otherwise if the motive was indirect. There can be no doubt, I think, as to Gordon, that he had been a pestilent firebrand, using the most violent language, which probably conduced to cause the insurrection. But, on the other hand, I think there was no evidence beyond that—that is to say, no evidence that he was party to an organized conspiracy to cause a rising throughout the island. But again, I cannot doubt, looking at the evidence, that it was generally believed in the island that he was so; and that Mr. Eyre and all those about him so believed. If you believe that Mr. Eyre sent him to be tried merely to get rid of him as a troublesome fellow, that was an act of oppression, and you should find the Bill. But if you believe, putting yourselves in Mr. Eyre’s position, seeing, so to speak, with his eyes, hearing with his ears, and having the state of things before you which were before him—if you believe that he *bona fide* thought that there was this conspiracy through the island, and that it was likely to break out into insurrection unless suppressed, and that it was really necessary and proper for the purpose of checking it that Gordon, whom he had believed was at the head of it, should be summarily tried, and that it was of importance that he, as the head of the insurrection, should be made an example of at once, in order to stop the insurrection—then I think that under the circumstances it cannot be said that the act was not justifiable; on the contrary, I think he would have been excused in so acting under the powers conferred by the local Legislature. That is, again, a question of fact for you to decide, putting yourselves as far as possible in his position at the time, and assuming those matters which he then believed. It may be that he was mistaken (though, as to that, you may come to a different conclusion; that is a matter of fact for you), but there is no ground for charging him criminally if you believe he honestly so thought. You must consider whether, looking at all the circumstances, putting yourselves as far as possible in his position, making due allowances for his responsibility and his position—

not, like ourselves, sitting here calmly and quietly considering the matter after the lapse of two or three years, thousands of miles away from the scene, but putting yourselves in his position, with all his responsibilities, every one urging him on and no one holding him back, with the general belief in the colony, which he shared,—if you come to the conclusion that, under all these circumstances, he acted as a man of reasonable moderation and firmness might have acted under such circumstances, then you ought not to present a criminal charge against him. Similar observations apply, of course, with stronger force to the other cases. For if he might be excused for sending into the proclaimed district a man who was tried and executed, of course he would be excusable in sending thither men who were only flogged, and still more so those who were not tried or punished at all, but only imprisoned. This concludes all I have to say to you by way of direction upon the law of the case. It involves points of great importance not merely to the decision of this case, but for the guidance of persons in authority in our colonies and elsewhere. What remains to be said is rather in the way of assistance to you in the performance of your own functions. The learned Judge here analyzed the indictment and the evidence, in substance as above abstracted. With reference to the evidence, he observed that the first evidence put in on the part of the prosecution was the statement of Mr. Eyre before the Commissioners. He was informed that he need not say any thing to criminate himself, but he scorned to take advantage of that. He believed he had done what was right; and he answered every thing fairly, fully, and frankly. The first evidence in the case against him consisted of his own statements, which were all printed in the Blue Book, and the whole of which they should read; for it was a well-known rule that if you chose to put in a man's statement against him you must take the whole of it, and cannot take the part which tells against him and disregard the part which may help him. If, for instance, he says he did such and such acts for such and such reasons, you cannot take his admissions against himself without also considering what were his reasons or his excuses for what he did. It may be that what he believed was not altogether true, but you will not, probably, have any doubt that he believed them to be true at the time. Further than that, when he says that he did so and so because he heard such and such things—that, of course, is no evidence that the facts were as he supposed them, but would be very important as showing what he believed at the time, and the grounds on which he acted. I call attention to these distinctions because they might not have occurred to you, and they are important. The whole question is for you—putting yourselves, as I have said, in the position of Mr. Eyre; knowing all that he knew, believing what he believed, and having all the information before you which he had—whether, taking all these things to be as he supposed them to be, they would justify what he did. You will have, therefore, to consider all that he said, and you must read the whole of his evidence. He in his evidence, in the most frank way, avowed what he did, and no one can doubt that he did send these six persons into the district under martial law. But the whole of his account of the matter is to be considered. Next there is the oral evidence, which for the most part, however, does not carry the case beyond what Mr. Eyre himself admits. For instance, the witness Lake proves that martial law was in force at Morant Bay; he tells a frightful story of the man hanged by the Provost-Marshal because he gnashed his teeth, it is said, in pain or in rage while being flogged; and no one can doubt that if this were so it was a most atrocious act; but there is not the slightest evidence that Mr. Eyre ever

heard of it. Not only is there no evidence that he directed it, but there is no evidence that he even heard of it. There is this, no doubt, to be considered, that when martial law is established it ought to be carefully looked to; that he put martial law in force, and that in this, and, I fear, other instances, terrible things were done. But I do not think that you can charge Mr. Eyre with these things. No doubt when martial law is in force in the sense of suspending the ordinary law and substituting summary procedure, common sense would tell a man that it should be carefully looked after. The Duke of Wellington once said that it came to this, that it was "the will of the commanding officer,"—a phrase which has been much criticized, and no doubt is not correct in the sense of something utterly arbitrary; but it is a discretionary power, and the person exercising it, therefore, ought to take great care that it is properly regulated. I cannot doubt that, owing to the want of care and control, and letting it "run riot," a vast deal was done which ought not to have been done. But I could not see how this could be made matter of charge against Mr. Eyre. And it would seem that the prosecutors have adopted this view, for they have no charge of this kind. No doubt some one ought to see to it that when the "dogs of war" are unslipped there should at least be a huntsman to control them. But the difficulty is in seeing who is to be responsible; the responsibility is divided among so many. No doubt some one ought to have seen to this, but it is difficult to say who; and consequently I feel that this cannot be charged criminally against Mr. Eyre. The prosecutors take the same view, and there is no such charge in the indictment. The fault was in the Legislature, in not having provided when martial law was allowed that some particular authority—probably the Commander-in-Chief—should be held responsible for its fair, proper, and temperate execution. But the Legislature having omitted this, it cannot be charged as a crime against Mr. Eyre that he did not exercise full control over the execution of martial law. Then you have the evidence of the persons who were imprisoned, and one of them was flogged, under circumstances, as he narrates them, certainly most atrocious; but there is no evidence to connect Mr. Eyre with it. I cannot find that he was even aware of it, still less that he sanctioned or allowed it. He trusted people to execute martial law, and some of them in the most atrocious way misconducted themselves; but he is not personally connected with it. So as to the evidence of one or two witnesses (Marsh and Rea) who were with the troops in one or two detachments, and described what occurred; and certainly they state most lamentable and terrible things, showing that there was a most lamentable want of discipline. But as to this part of the case the answer of Mr. Eyre is complete; for when he directed the Commander-in-Chief to "cut off and capture the insurgents"—to prevent them from getting into the other parts of the island—the officers ought to have exercised proper discipline and control. There was a terrible failure of proper discipline, but you cannot say that Mr. Eyre is criminally responsible for the acts of the military. He would have been responsible if he had sent them with directions to do these things, but he is not responsible for their want of discipline. The learned Judge then briefly analyzed the indictment. As to the first three counts for proclaiming martial law, he said, they proceeded upon the supposition that there was no power to declare martial law, and that it was as illegal as if it was in London or Bristol, as to which he had already shown that it was otherwise, by virtue of the colonial statutes. The Governor might have been culpable if he had declared martial law when there was no occasion for it, but this could not be said under the circum-

stances. And, looking at the insurrection, the massacre, and the efforts of the insurgent negroes to rouse the country for the purpose of insurrection (said the learned Judge with emphasis), I have no hesitation in saying that not only there was no culpability in declaring martial law, but that probably the Governor would have been punishable, if he had not declared it. Next, as to the more serious matter, the keeping the martial law up for thirty days, you must put yourselves, as I have said, in the position of Mr. Eyre, and say if you think he can be considered criminally responsible. You must remember that the statutes speak of "apprehended insurrection" and of "danger," and that Mr. Eyre believed that there was an organized conspiracy; and, though the evidence does not lead me to that conclusion, still he might honestly think so. The question would present itself to his mind thus, "Shall I stop it? If I do not stop it, and the colony is consequently exposed to all the frightful horrors of insurrection, I shall have done a great mischief." The criminality of Mr. Eyre, under these circumstances, must depend upon the extent to which you think that a man of calmness and firmness of mind might have so thought. You must, I repeat, put yourselves in his position, and make all allowance for a person in that position. Then there are the counts as to the case of Gordon, as to which, if you believe Mr. Eyre honestly thought that he was really guilty, and that there was such a danger from an organized conspiracy that it was necessary that he should be punished promptly in order to suppress the insurrection, then you ought not to find a true bill on these charges. Then as to the charges with reference to the flogging of Phillips. I have looked through the evidence in vain to find any proof that Mr. Eyre authorized it. He sent him to be tried, no doubt; but there is no evidence that he sanctioned what was done. So as to the act of the Provost-Marshal in hanging the man Marshal. And now I have concluded every thing I have to say to you, except as to the Bill of Indemnity, as to which there may be a doubt; I advise you, therefore, not to let it stand in your way if you think there is a case on all or any of the counts in the indictment.

The Grand Jury returned "No true bill."

IV.

RISK ALLAH v. THE DAILY TELEGRAPH.

THIS was tried on the 13th of June at Nisi Prius before Lord Chief Justice Cockburn and a special Jury. It was an action against the proprietors of the *Daily Telegraph* for libel, the alleged libels being contained in certain letters from their correspondent at Brussels relative to the trial of Risk Allah there in October, 1866, for the murder of his ward, Readly, and also in a leading article upon it. The libels were complained of as representing that he was guilty of the murder, and, at all events, clearly guilty of forgery and fraud. The defendants did not acknowledge this and justify its truth; but pleaded "Not Guilty"—i. e. a denial that there were any such imputations, or, if there were, that they went beyond the privilege attaching to a fair report and fair comments thereupon.

The whole question being, as the Lord Chief Justice more than once clearly laid down, whether the letters in substance amounted to a report which was fair, and whether, if so, the comments founded thereon were fair, of course the first question was what in substance the letters represented; and, in the next place,

whether those representations in substance were supported by what passed at the trial. It is not easy to collect and state clearly what the letters did really represent, because they were very lengthy, and were not in the form of regular reports, but of "letters from a correspondent," largely mixed with observations of a picturesque and descriptive character. On the other hand, as probably no one would seriously complain of matter of this kind unless it was libellous, it is sufficient to give such passages as were particularly complained of on that ground, adding, however, such passages as appeared to show that there was, at all events, no intention to be unfair. The letters were as follows:—

"On the 30th of March, 1865, between the hours of seven and eight in the morning, a young Englishman, named Charles Readly, was killed in his bed at Antwerp by the discharge of a gun. Readly occupied a room No. 7 on the second floor of the Hotel du Rhin. He had for a travelling companion a person named Risk Allah. Immediately after the fatal discharge Risk Allah was arrested on the charge of having murdered Readly, but was subsequently set at liberty in consequence of the report of a Juge d'Instruction, who attributed the death of the young Englishman to suicide. Subsequent investigations, however, induced the Belgian Government to renew the prosecution of Risk Allah."

Then, after much personal description, came the substance of the *acte d'accusation*, which it was admitted by the plaintiff's counsel could not be complained of: "In the *acte d'accusation* of Risk Allah prejudicial statements and suggestions are introduced which counsel would never be permitted to use in this country; for example, references to former convictions of some of the prisoner's supposed companions."

It is necessary to mention here that the account of the *acte d'accusation* ended thus:—"It is pronounced to have been absolutely impossible that after firing the gun the unfortunate youth could have put his hands under the bedclothes. That Readly died by his own act seems incredible, and if the *acte d'accusation* be correct Risk Allah was the only person near the sleeping apartment of his step-son at the time when the fatal wound was inflicted."

But then the writer went on so as to show he was speaking of the *acte d'accusation*: "When the accusing document had been read right through," &c. The letter then, after this caution, stated the principal statements in the *acte d'accusation* of indictment, and it then proceeded, "When the accusing document had been read the President proceeded to interrogate the accused. With a sudden and impulsive energy, when asked whether he did not know that the sum of 5000*l.* would revert to him under the contract of marriage, in case of Readly's dying before he attained the age of twenty-one, Risk Allah Bey protested his entire ignorance of any such provision. On every point of this tremendous *acte d'accusation* the prisoner was interrogated rigidly. His answers were shrewd, prompt, terse, and those of a man either strong in innocence or a very bold malefactor. In any case they were the answers of a man more than commonly intellectual."

So much for the first letter. Then in the next there was this: "I have heard from witnesses and others many opinions about Risk Allah, and I may say, without exactly feeling bound to say it, that the full half of the personal testimony is in his favour—that is, that a great many people don't think he murdered Readly, though they believe him guilty of forgery and fraud—and the very same persons who take this view are not by any means disposed to pity Risk Allah. . . . I have, indeed, perceived a very general

readiness to acquit, on the forcible proposition that he is a cross between a serpent and a tiger."

This, however, seemed to be meant merely as a personal expression, for the next passage was, "There is no question that the man is handsome," &c. Then followed a piece of personal description, and then came a statement of some evidence as to close intimacy between Risk Allah and certain dishonest persons. Then came the statement of the evidence of a witness called to show Readly's disinclination to suicide, but who had made a deposition to the contrary effect, which latter deposition was referred to and was stated in the report as fairly as the other evidence. Then in a third letter came, after much matter of dramatic description, a most important passage, partaking of the character of a report, stating the President's interrogation of the accused, which was of a hostile character, but to which the answers of the accused appeared to be given as fully and fairly as the inquiries. And an episode in which the prisoner's able counsel utterly demolished a piece of spurious evidence against him was described as dramatically as any thing else. The letter at its conclusion contained this important passage with reference to a most important witness, "The witness being rather bound, if any thing, to excuse the authorities of the city for having released Risk Allah, described the position of the body in language as guarded and reticent as possible, but still very much of a kind to destroy the theory of suicide, and, by consequence, to set up the theory of deliberate murder."

In the fourth letter there was a full statement of the evidence given as to the settlement executed on Risk Allah's marriage with his wife, with a view to show that he would gain by her death, and also by Readly's. Then came another witness, as to whom there was this passage:—

"The President.—Risk Allah says he was ignorant of the terms of his wife's settlement. Will you say whether, in your judgment, that could have been possible?"

"Witness.—I do not think it could have been possible.

"Here Risk Allah rose and attempted to confute some of the witness's statements, which were, indeed, rather based on opinion than absolute fact. The failure of the accused to demonstrate any remote probability of his having married without being acquainted with the conditions of the contract was so evident that M. Lachaud (his advocate), putting the best face on the matter, motioned him to sit down, as if the point were not worth contesting."

Then came a notice of the evidence for the prosecution as to the experiments of "experts," with a view to show that the theory of suicide was not tenable, because it was impossible for a person whose body was found in such a position to have shot himself. The evidence of an "expert" on this point was given very dramatically. Then came this passage, giving the general effect of the evidence on the subject, "One of the witnesses, a doctor, spoke to this effect, 'When I entered Readly's chamber the body was in the attitude of one who had slept, the head being turned towards the wall. We concluded from the autopsy that death must have been quite instantaneous. Only on the supposition that the body had been moved, and its position altered, could we believe this to be a case of suicide. If the arms had not been placed down by the sides of the corpse by some person after Readly's death, it was no suicide most certainly.' All other evidence hitherto given has confirmed this view. Down to the time of the Court's rising to-day forty witnesses have been examined."

It may be observed that in a case in which the evidence was so voluminous, only the substance could be given, and that the question would, of course, be whether the substance on both sides was fairly given. And at the opening of the next letter there was a statement which actually amounted to an anticipation of a verdict of acquittal of the murder: "It was pretty plainly said by the President to-day that the proofs of murder are insufficient, and that the hypothesis of suicide is tenable." And afterwards, with reference to the evidence of the experts, "They each and all shrank from the terrible obligation of asserting on oath that suicide in this case was an absolute impossibility." And then, "The President turning to Risk Allah apprised him that the Court had, on the evidence of the experts, formed the opinion that it was possible for the deed to have been Ready's own." But there afterwards was this, "But though Risk Allah will doubtless be acquitted of the crime of murder, he will not now, as before, be discharged a free man. The proofs of forgery and fraud are overwhelming, and on these he is to be detained for another trial."

In the next letter it was stated that, "Two of the five gunmakers, and also Dr. Schoppens, the surgeon, this day withdrew the opinion that they had expressed that the shot which killed Ready might have been possibly fired by his own hand. . . . When the President evoked yesterday the admission of a possibility of Ready's having killed himself, the flood-time of Risk Allah's dark and turbulent tide did indeed seem to have been taken for his advantage. But to-day that tide was unexpectedly turned, and the case for the defence has gone less swimmingly than it seemed at first to be going. The opinion of the experts, given with qualifying doubts, has been in three cases retracted; and the evidence is at present but evenly balanced for and against the bare possibility that this could have been suicide and not murder. Two Antwerp gunmakers and M. Charrin, *lieutenant de place*, hold to the theory that suicide was possible; the officer even goes so far as to say that it was in his belief more likely, from all the appearances, than the act of an assassin. On the other hand, Messrs. Jansen and Montigny, the Brussels gunmakers, and Dr. Schoppens, the Antwerp surgeon, having reconsidered the question, with the help of fresh experiments, decidedly state that the young man could not have destroyed his own life and left such appearances as were observed."

Afterwards the remarkable experiment made by Lieutenant Charrin, which so powerfully conduced to the acquittal, was described very dramatically. Then it was added, "The difficulty was, then, to account for the position of the arms, which were stretched downwards in the composed attitude of slumber, notwithstanding the fact proved by surgeons that instant paralysis must have been caused by the shattering of the spinal column. Dr. Devisme combatted the theory; and cited the example of a soldier who had made five or six steps, holding his musket in his hand, after having received such a wound. Dr. Schoppens, however, persisted in declaring that a movement necessary to bring Ready's arms into the position in which they were found could not have occurred after the instantaneous death he must have died. Moreover, the way in which the coverlet was disposed over the upper part of the body and arms could not possibly be reconciled with the hypothesis of suicide. Those gunmakers who had with much hesitation subscribed to the theory of Ready's having possibly shot himself, now asked permission to withdraw their testimony, saying that their conclusions must, in a measure, be formed on the surgical testimony. 'If,' said Dr. Montigny, 'Dr. Schoppens declares that the move-

ments were impossible, I retract the opinion which I gave in support of the suicide theory.' And M. Jansen said the same thing, perhaps a little more strongly. In the midst of this conflicting evidence of experts, each of them in turn got upon the bed and tested the practicability of pointing the gun in such a manner as to commit suicide, as Ready is supposed by the defenders of Risk Allah to have committed it."

Then followed a statement of the speech of the Procureur-Général against the accused, and in the next letter it was continued. In the next, the speech of M. Lachaud, the eloquent advocate of the prisoner, was stated, as appeared, with still greater force, the best passages being given *verbatim*, though, on the other hand (as observed by the Lord Chief Justice) the speech of the prisoner's counsel, which—less eloquent, but, perhaps, more important, as it dealt with the facts—was omitted. In a word, the letters were evidently directed to the giving a general idea of the case than a regular report. Then the result, a verdict of acquittal, was stated; and it was added that "when it was announced there was great applause and enthusiasm in court." Such was the substance of the letters. Then came a leading article, of which the effect seemed to be that Risk Allah had escaped, but that the evidence was, to say the least, strong against him: "He has been declared 'Not Guilty,' in a word, in spite of terrible suspicions." And again, "A polished gentleman, whose wife had unfortunately perished, and whose ward was found one morning with a gun-shot wound on him." And at the close, "We defy any one to read the record of that long trial without coming to the conclusion that the result might have been different had the defence been less skilfully conducted."

Such was the substance of the alleged libel, of which, as the action was founded thereon, it is essential to give the effect. It is equally essential to give the substance of the voluminous evidence adduced, with a view to show that these publications were not legal, and were libellous, because not fair reports nor fair comments thereon.

The plaintiff had also been tried at Brussels, for complicity in a forgery committed by one Osman Effendi, a Pole or Russian—and actions had been brought against him in the Probate Court and in the Court of Chancery, in reference to some share transactions between him and a gentleman named Bingham; but the result was that Risk Allah was cross-examined, the suit in Chancery was compromised, and all imputations against him were withdrawn, the Court of Chancery striking out as impertinent and scandalous the charges made against him in the bill, and ordering that he should receive his costs. This matter was also brought up against him at the trial in Brussels, and the observations made upon it in the defendants' newspaper formed one of the subjects of the present action.

The most important part of the evidence adduced, with a view to show that these publications were not legal, and were libellous because not fair reports nor fair comments thereon, was that which related to the statements of the experts. It was not charged that the writer of the reports had any personal feeling against the plaintiff, or any intentional unfairness; but it was complained that the letters were on most important points entirely untrue; that the whole report was compiled from the *Écho du Parlement*, and hastily and carelessly compiled, and that it was manifest that the writer was not in court at all, or, at all events, even if he were, had made no notes nor *bond fide* report of his own, but had merely got it up very carelessly from other men's materials

at second-hand. The most important part of the evidence for the defence, it will be manifest, was the evidence of the "experts," and it was proved that the passage in the letters stating that the "experts" had retracted their opinions in favour of the prisoner was in a great degree—indeed almost entirely—untrue; that, in particular, this passage was just the reverse of the evidence actually given:—"If," said Dr. Martigny, "Dr. Schoppens declares that the movements" (of the body) "were impossible, I retract the opinion which I gave in support of the suicide theory." It was proved that the witness said just the reverse, viz. that if Dr. Schoppens declared the movements possible, he (the witness) retracted the opinion which he had given against the theory of suicide. And, again, as to the statement that the gunsmiths examined for the defence retracted their opinions in its favour, it appeared that they all firmly adhered to it, so there was a serious fault in the omission of certain evidence as to the door being locked inside. And then, again, in the omission of much material evidence in favour of the plaintiff. These were the most important instances of absolute misstatement of material matters. There were many other instances adduced, however, of a want of correctness or completeness in the report, and it was, indeed, complained that the letters were not really reports at all, but rather highly-coloured representations. And in the course of the address of the plaintiff's counsel the Lord Chief Justice pointed out that five of the experts who were described as having given evidence in favour of the plaintiff on one day and then retracted it the next day had actually not been examined until the next day at all, showing, as the Lord Chief Justice observed, that the writer of the letters was not really a reporter, and had not really written reports, but had compiled his letters from materials derived from other sources.

Mr. Coleridge, Q.C., addressed the jury for the defence. He admitted, he said, that reckless reports or comments of the Press were actionable not less than those which were personally malicious. And he admitted, also, that this was no question of the liberty of the Press, but a question whether that liberty had been abused—that is, whether the reports or the comments were consciously unfair. But he desired the jury to understand what was the real issue before them, which was not whether the plaintiff, Risk Allah, was really guilty, but whether the letters and articles upon his case were or were not recklessly unfair. The plaintiff, however, tried to make these proceedings the means of a general rehabilitation of his character at the expense of the defendants. Coming as he did before a jury for damages for supposed injury to his character, it was material to know what manner of man he was, for, in common sense and justice, the measure of damages for injury to a man's character must be the value of his character. And for this reason he had entered somewhat into the antecedents of the plaintiff, the kind of associates he had had, and so forth. Adventurers were men who shrouded their whole life in obscurity, and by false pretences obtained a position which did not really belong to them. The learned counsel commented on the extraordinary character of the plaintiff's statement, and then proceeded to the death of Readly. He did not, he contended, say that Risk Allah committed the murder; but this he said, that all the circumstances of the case would have well warranted a conviction, and that, though the accused escaped conviction, yet the circumstantial evidence bore strongly against him. The real guilt or innocence of the party tried was not the proper test of the responsibility of a public writer in commenting upon a trial for murder; the question would be what appeared at the trial.

The Lord Chief Justice then proceeded to sum up the case to the jury. Gentlemen, he said, the case divides itself into two distinct subjects, to be looked at with reference to different principles and considerations, and therefore essentially distinct. The plaintiff complains, first, that in a series of communications professing to be reports of what passed at the court in Brussels, at a trial in which he was charged with forgery and murder, an unfair and prejudicial report has been published; and, secondly, that after the trial had ended in his acquittal the defendants, in an article commenting upon the trial and the reports, published a repetition of the charge. Now, take the two parts of the case in the order in which I have stated them, and, first, as to the reports. I am glad that all are agreed as to what is the law, and that, whatever may have been thought in past times, now-a-days, at all events, we are all agreed that a fair and impartial report of the proceedings of a court of justice, although, as incidental to them, it may embody matter defamatory to an individual, is, nevertheless, privileged and protected, the public interest and advantage in having the reports published preponderating so much over the inconvenience to individuals as to justify the sacrifice of private inconvenience to the public good. But the condition upon which alone the privilege can be maintained is that the report shall be fair, truthful, honest, and impartial. It need not be a report of every thing, nor of all the proceedings of a long trial; the report may be long, or it may be more condensed, but still you must have an honest and impartial and substantially fair account, or there is no privilege for the publication of defamatory matter. Of course, if there is no defamatory matter, there is no occasion for privilege. But if the reporter adds facts or statements of his own, which are defamatory, then he cannot claim the benefit of the privilege. Whether the trial of a British subject by a foreign tribunal is within the privilege is a question which has not been raised to-day. But the proposition is not contested that unless the reports are fair they are not privileged. Having thus told you what is the law, I ask your attention to the series of letters or reports, with the view of your forming your judgment as to whether they come within the privilege. Gentlemen, they are certainly a different style from what we are accustomed to in the reports of our English courts. The style has been described as "sensational"—perhaps it might be called a foreign style. There is a tendency abroad to dramatize every thing, and this is in that style. It may be attractive, but it is dangerous to pass from facts to fancy. The report, which ought to be truthful, is apt to become fanciful and fantastic. And if the reporter draws upon his fancy, and has particular views upon the subject, he may unconsciously convey that impression in place of the real facts. I hope, therefore, that we shall in our courts continue to adhere to the simple, truthful mode of reporting. But it is not because you may think this sensational style is in bad taste that therefore you are to allow any feeling of that sort to weigh with you in considering the limit of the privilege. The Lord Chief Justice then went through the various matters complained of in the report. As to the first, a statement which was a little ambiguous, as to whether it was taken from the *acte d'accusation* or was the reporter's own statement, his Lordship said he thought, on the whole, that it was meant as taken from the *acte d'accusation*. Alluding to the passage in which it was stated that one half of the personal testimony was in favour of Risk Allah, but that some people seemed to think he looked a cross between the serpent and the tiger, his Lordship observed that remarks of that sort could not be justifiable in a report, but that mere matters of personal description were not

of much importance one way or another. Then came what the writer called a "damaging story," as told by a particular witness, as to which the Lord Chief Justice said the witness certainly did so state, and it was "damaging," so that this did not seem to be justly matter of complaint. But it was questionable whether the writer had a right to add that the witness was "reticent," so as to convey the idea that he rather understated the case. He would now come, however, he said, to more important matters. There was a passage insinuating by means of an allusion to a passage in Shakespeare, that Risk Allah was a villain. The jury would judge how far that was consistent with the fair privilege of a report, and whether it was not going far beyond the function of a reporter to state that the person accused was a "villain." Adverting to another passage in which the writer spoke of Risk Allah's beard whitening, the Lord Chief Justice observed that if this was meant as mere matter of dramatic description it did not much matter; but if it meant to convey that the evidence was pressing upon the accused, and that he felt it oppressing him, then it went far beyond the proper function of a reporter to make observations of that kind, which were most prejudicial to the accused. Then, as to the important evidence of the "experts," the Lord Chief Justice entered fully into the effect of the statement in the report, which he said was entirely erroneous, and conveyed an impression quite the contrary of the truth, for the real fact was that the majority of the "experts" were from the first in favour of the theory of suicide, and not only never retracted that opinion, but adhered to it; and, indeed, one of them went so far as to assert his positive belief and certainty that it was a case of suicide. Moreover, the Lord Chief Justice remarked that it was manifest from the discrepancy between the statement in the letter and the actual fact as to the day on which the "experts" were examined that the writer was not in court at all. Referring to the report in the *Écho du Parlement*, and reading this part of it at length, the Lord Chief Justice showed that the writer could not have been in court, and that his statement as to the "experts" having retracted their opinion in favour of the plaintiff was the opposite of what really occurred, for they not only, after repeated experiments, maintained it, but with greater certainty. And it was utterly incorrect to say that though the plaintiff was discharged as to the murder the proofs of forgery and fraud remained, and that he was detained upon them. It was not true; he had been tried as well upon those charges as upon the other, and equally acquitted; and he was not detained. Then came the further statement as to the evidence of the "experts," that they were evenly balanced. This was quite incorrect; for only one retained his view contrary to the theory of suicide; the others were strongly in favour of the theory, and one of them went so far as to say that he was certain of it. The writer stated that one of them said the theory of suicide was impossible. This only showed that the writer could not have been present at the trial and must have taken his facts second-hand; for it was utterly and entirely unfounded. No doubt there was no reason to impute personal ill-feeling to the writer, and no doubt the writer wrote under the honest conviction that the facts told strongly against the plaintiff, and wrote without any intention of doing injustice. But while (said his Lordship) we uphold the liberty of the Press, and especially in the matter of reports of proceedings in courts of justice, and while it is to the interest of the public that they should be made known as widely as possible, we must take care that those who exercise that all-important function should act under a due sense of the duty they have to discharge. If you think the letters do not embody a fair and

faithful representation of what passed at the trial, but that the reporter has gone beyond the legitimate bounds of his privilege by introducing statements of his own injurious to the plaintiff, and which turn out to be unfounded, then it will be your duty to find for the plaintiff as to the publication of the letters. Then there is the other cause of complaint, as to the article published after his acquittal. It has been suggested that it did not convey the impression that he was guilty, but only that he was innocent, and had had a very narrow escape; but if it conveyed the impression that he was guilty, and had for some reason had a narrow escape, then the accused, if innocent, would have a good ground of complaint. Another just question, therefore, would be, what the article really meant. The Lord Chief Justice then went through it, dwelling upon the passages which have been quoted, especially the sentence, "the Syrian gentleman whose wife perished, and whose ward was found with a gunshot wound in his head." What did that mean? What could the whole article be understood to convey? Did it mean that he was guilty, and had had a narrow escape? or did it mean that he was innocent, and had had such an escape? If the jury thought that it meant that a man who had been acquitted by a verdict of a jury was really guilty, then the question would be whether it could be excused, under the circumstances, by the privilege which the law wisely allowed to public writers in the discussion of matters of public interest. It was admitted that the administration of justice was so important to the well-being of society that public writers have the right of discussing it, even although in so doing they may bear hard upon individuals; and therefore, although they should turn out to have been erroneous in their observations, yet if they have written in good faith, with an honest desire to discharge their duty, bringing to it a reasonable judgment, they are not legally liable, and therefore the jury were rightly invited to consider whether the circumstances were such as to allow of the claim of privilege, even although it was intended to impute that the crime of murder was really committed. And with a view to the consideration of that question it was necessary to go into the circumstances of the case, and to inquire what were the facts proved against the plaintiff, and what were in his favour. Now no doubt the circumstances of the case were such as that when they were first looked at they must naturally suggest the idea of guilt; but after they had been examined into, the question was whether such an article could be written in a fair spirit, and with a reasonable exercise of judgment. What were the facts? That Risk Allah had insured the youth's life; that the youth had received a shot as he lay in bed; that at first sight there seemed no probability of suicide. Such was the aspect of the case at first sight; but, even looking at it thus there were two facts calculated to dispel the idea of murder; the fact of the youth's shirt being taken off, and the fact of the paper found in his handwriting bearing the words, "I have done it." There was no reason to doubt that the youth usually slept in a shirt of some sort, and it was not found upon him. There was no rational possibility of its having been taken off by any one else, and he must have taken it off himself. Nothing was said about a shirt being found stained with blood—a fact which, had it occurred, would not have escaped the attention of the prosecutors. Then, assuming the shirt to have been found (as seems to have been assumed at the trial) clean and free from blood, it was impossible not to see that he must have taken it off; and this was a fact almost conclusive as to suicide, for, with what possible motive could he have taken it off except with a view to suicide, in order (as was suggested) to avoid the possibility of its catching fire? Then as to the paper, the experts proved it

to have been in the youth's handwriting; and there was no reason to impute forgery to the plaintiff; so that there seemed no ground for doubting that it was the youth's own writing. If so, it was all but conclusive as to suicide. Then there were the experiments of the experts, and their evidence. The majority of these were in the plaintiff's favour; one went so far as to say he was certain it was suicide. Then there was the evidence as to the character and health of the youth, who was irregular in his mind and epileptic in his habit of body. Then came the rejection of his offer of marriage upon that account, which, beyond all doubt, had preyed upon his mind. Several respectable witnesses stated that after this the youth had spoken in a desponding and despairing way, and it was plain that disappointment and despair were preying upon his mind. Taking all these circumstances into account, could any one fairly say that the verdict was wrong? It was true that Risk Allah would gain 5000*l.* by the youth's death, but that was all. It was said he had insured the youth's life for 1000*l.*; but the youth had acknowledged to several witnesses that he owed the plaintiff 700*l.* Therefore the notion that the plaintiff had insured the youth's life with a view to get rid of him appeared to fall to the ground. Thus the case of Risk Allah as to motive was relieved of that. The Lord Chief Justice then said that under all the circumstances it was for the jury to say, not merely whether they did not think that Risk Allah was innocent, but whether they thought that in the fair, honest, reasonable exercise of a public writer's privilege, an article could be written imputing that the plaintiff was guilty. If they thought that the writer had rashly, recklessly, and wantonly represented a man who had been acquitted as guilty, they should give a verdict for the plaintiff. The Lord Chief Justice then entered into the matter of Osman's forgeries, putting it to the jury whether they were or were not satisfied with the plaintiff's explanation. The plaintiff had been acquitted at Brussels, and if a public writer challenged the verdict, he should do so in a fair and proper spirit and in the exercise of an honest and reasonable judgment.

The jury gave a verdict for the plaintiff for 960*l.*

V.

MARTIN *v.* MACKONOCHIE.

RITUALISM.

THIS case, which involved the important question as to high ceremonial in the church of St. Alban's, Holborn, the incumbent of which was the Rev. A. H. Mackonochie, was an appeal by the promoters of the suit from the judgment of the Dean of Arches to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Present—The Archbishop of York, Lord Chelmsford, Lord Cairns, Sir W. Erle, and Sir J. Colville.

Lord Cairns delivered the judgment of the Committee as follows:—"The case of '*Martin v. Mackonochie*,' commenced before the Bishop of London, was, under the provisions of the Clergy Discipline Act, sent by the Bishop to the Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury for trial in the first instance; and having been fully heard before the Judge of the Arches' Court, resulted in a decree made on the 28th of March, 1868. Mr. Mackonochie, the clerk in holy orders against whom these proceedings were directed was charged with four offences against the

laws ecclesiastical, viz.:—1. The elevation during or after the Prayer of Consecration in the Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion of the paten and cup, and the kneeling or prostrating himself before the consecrated elements; 2. Using lighted candles on the communion-table during the celebration of the Holy Communion, when such candles were not wanted for the purpose of giving light; 3. Using incense in the celebration of the Holy Communion; 4. Mixing water with the wine used in the administration of the Holy Communion. The learned Judge of the Arches' Court by his decree sustained the third and fourth of these charges, and admonished Mr. Mackonochie to abstain for the future from the use of incense, and from mixing water with the wine as pleaded in the articles. Against this part of the decree there is no appeal. The second charge, as to lights, was not sustained, the learned judge holding that it was lawful to place two lighted candles on the Communion-table during the time of the Holy Communion. Against this the promoter has appealed. As to the first charge, Mr. Mackonochie, while admitting the elevation of the consecrated elements at the times and in the manner alleged, pleaded that he had discontinued the practice before the institution of the suit. The learned Judge, therefore, admonished Mr. Mackonochie not to recur to the practice; but as to the other part of the charge—namely, the kneeling and prostrating himself before the consecrated elements, the learned Judge held that if Mr. Mackonochie had committed any error in that respect it was one which should not form the subject of a criminal prosecution, but should be referred to the Bishop in order that he might exercise his discretion thereon. The promoter appeals from the latter part of the decision of the learned judge on this charge, and he also complains in his appeal that the defendant was not ordered to pay the costs of the suit. The questions thus raised by the appeal were very fully and ably argued before this tribunal, and their Lordships have now to state their reasons for the advice which they propose humbly to offer to her Majesty. They will advert first to the charge of kneeling before the consecrated elements. It is necessary to refer to the whole of the charge on this head as contained in the 3rd and 4th articles, although some of the acts charged are said to have been discontinued before the suit commenced. These articles run thus:—

“‘3. That the said Alexander Heriot Mackonochie has in his said church, and within two years last past (to wit, on Sunday, the 23rd day of December, on Christmas-day last past, and on Sunday, the 30th day of December, all in the year of our Lord, 1866), during the Prayer of Consecration in the Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion, elevated the paten above his head, and permitted and sanctioned such elevation, and taken into his hands the cup, and elevated it above his head during the Prayer of Consecration aforesaid, and permitted and sanctioned the cup to be so taken and elevated, and knelt or prostrated himself before the consecrated elements during the Prayer of Consecration, and permitted and sanctioned such kneeling or prostrating by other clerks in holy orders. 4. That such elevation of the paten, and such taking and elevation of the cup, and such kneeling and prostrating are severally unlawful additions to and variations from the form and order prescribed and appointed by the said statutes, and by the said Book of Common Prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, and are contrary to the said statutes, and to the 14th, 36th, and 38th of the said constitutions and canons, and also to an Act of Parliament passed in a Session of Parliament holden in the 13th year of Queen Elizabeth, cap. 12, and to the 25th and 28th of the Articles of Religion therein referred to.’

"Mr. Mackonochie's answer to these articles is as follows:—

"3. Whereas in the 3rd article, given in and admitted as amended in this cause, it is pleaded that the said Alexander Heriot Mackonochie has—to wit, on Sunday, the 23rd day of December, on Christmas-day last past, on Sunday, the 30th day of December, all in the year 1866—during the Prayer of Consecration in the Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion elevated the paten above his head and permitted and sanctioned such elevation, and taken into his hands the cup and elevated it above his head during the Prayer of Consecration aforesaid, and permitted and sanctioned the cup so to be taken and elevated, and knelt or prostrated himself before the consecrated elements during the Prayer of Consecration, and permitted and sanctioned such kneeling or prostration by other clerks in holy orders; now, the same is in part untruly pleaded, for the party proponent alleges that, while he admits that the said Alexander Heriot Mackonochie did on the said two Sundays and on Christmas-day, during the Prayer of Consecration, kneel and sanction kneeling by other clerks before the Lord's table, he denies that his said party did on the said two Sundays and on the said Christmas-day kneel or prostrate himself before the consecrated elements, or permit and sanction such kneeling or prostration by other clerks in holy orders, as in the 3rd article pleaded. And he further alleges that while he admits that he did on the said two Sundays and Christmas-day, in the said 3rd article mentioned, elevate and sanction the elevation by other clerks of the paten and cup above his head, as is in the said 3rd article pleaded, yet that such elevation of the paten and cup has been wholly discontinued by the said Alexander Heriot Mackonochie during the administration of the Holy Communion ever since the said 30th day of December, 1866, and long prior to the institution of this suit. That such practice was discontinued in consequence of legal advice, and in compliance with the expressed wish of the Lord Bishop of the diocese of London and with a resolution of Convocation, as was well known to the promoter of this suit before he instituted the same."

"Before turning to the evidence in support of this charge, it will be proper to consider a preliminary objection which was taken to the articles, and to the letters of request and citation by which they were preceded. It was said that although the articles alleged that the respondent 'knelt or prostrated himself before the consecrated elements during the Prayer of Consecration,' the letters of request and citation were for 'bowing, kneeling, or prostrating himself before the consecrated elements during or after the Prayer of Consecration.' It was contended that the citation showed no offence, for it might be taken, as in an indictment, in the sense most favourable to the accused, and as affirming nothing more than that he bowed after the Prayer of Consecration, which, it was said, would or might be innocent. And the articles, it was argued, by omitting this alternative, were a departure from the citation. To this it might be sufficient to reply that the objection taken to this citation—a citation which it is not disputed does contain other charges cognizable by the Ecclesiastical Court—is an objection of a strictly technical character, and one which would be waived by the appearance of the respondent as he did appear, without protest, and by praying for articles. But, passing from this, it is to be observed that the supposed analogy between the citation and an indictment, on which this objection is founded, entirely fails. The Act of Uniformity, 1st Elizabeth, c. 2, contemplates two modes of procedure for enforcing its provisions—one by indictment under section 4, and the other by process for admonition before the Ordinary under section 23; and it is

under the latter, and not the former, section, that the present proceedings are taken. Moreover, in the case of an indictment followed by judgment, the indictment and judgment become the record, and the judgment is read with reference to the indictment; and if the indictment is open to a construction which is innocent, and would not sustain a judgment, the judgment would be vicious, and must be arrested; whereas the citation is followed by articles, which in turn are met by a plea; and the Court, after hearing evidence, defines by its sentence how much of the charge it considers to be relevant and to have been proved, and thereby corrects any excess of averment in the citation. The preliminary objection, therefore, on this charge their Lordships feel themselves obliged to repel. It is necessary now to examine the evidence adduced in support of the charge; and in doing this, and in considering the character of the charge itself, their Lordships will confine their attention to the conduct and acts of the respondent as the celebrating or consecrating minister. The allegations and proof as to 'Sanctioning and permitting other clerks' are so vague, that no weight could be, and in the argument little weight was attempted to be, given to them. The chief witness in support of the charge is Mr. Beames. He has not been cross-examined, and no evidence has been adduced for the respondent. The statement of Mr. Beames may therefore be taken to be uncontroverted. He speaks of the 23rd and 25th of December, 1866. On both of these occasions the respondent was the celebrant at the Communion Service. The effect of the answers of Mr. Beames may be stated to be that the respondent commenced to read the Prayer of Consecration standing; that on reaching the words 'the same night that He was betrayed' he elevated the paten above his head, returned it to its place on the Communion-table, and then knelt on his knees towards the table, inclining or prostrating his head towards the ground; that he then rose and resumed the prayer; that when, in the further course of the prayer, he took the chalice, he elevated it above his head as he had done the paten, replaced it on the Communion-table, and knelt or prostrated himself as before. The elevation of the elements has, as already said, been discontinued, and as to the kneeling after the consecration of the chalice, it might be possibly suggested that it was a kneeling after finishing the Prayer of Consecration, and with reference to the next part of the service, in which the celebrant becomes himself the recipient. Omitting, therefore, for the present, the elevation and the second kneeling, the evidence remains that the respondent, after commencing the Prayer of Consecration standing, paused in the middle of the prayer, knelt down, inclining or prostrating his head towards the ground, and then, rising up again, continued the prayer standing. In order to bring the conduct of the respondent on this head to the test of ecclesiastical law, it is proper now to turn to the Rubric of the Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion. The Lord's prayer and the collect, with which the services commence, are to be said by the priest 'standing at the north side of the table.' The priest is then to turn to the people and rehearse distinctly all the Ten Commandments, 'the people still kneeling,' implying that the priest is still to stand. This is to be followed by one of the collects for the Sovereign, 'the priest standing as before,' and, by the collect for the day. The priest is then to read the Epistle and Gospel, and to say the Creed, during which no change of attitude is indicated. After the sermon, when the priest has returned to the Lord's table, the sentences of the offertory, the prayer for the Church Militant, and the exhortations are to be 'said' by the priest, without any direction as to change of posture, and then, at the confession, he, as well as all the people, is directed to

kneel. For the absolution and the sentences which follow the priest is directed to stand up, and to turn himself to the people; for the words 'It is very meet,' &c., and the 'prefaces,' he is to turn to the Lord's table, and he is then to kneel down at the Lord's table, and, in the name of all the recipients, say the prayer, 'We do not presume,' &c. The Rubric before the Prayer of Consecration then follows, and is in these words:—'When the priest, standing before the table, hath so ordered the bread and wine that he may with more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration as follows.' Their Lordships entertain no doubt on the construction of this Rubric, that the priest is intended to continue in one posture during the prayer, and not to change from standing to kneeling, or *vice versa*; and it appears to them equally certain that the priest is intended to stand, and not to kneel. They think that the words 'standing before the table' apply to the whole sentence; and they think this is made more apparent by the consideration that acts are to be done by the priest before the people as the prayer proceeds (such as taking the paten and chalice into his hands, breaking the bread, and laying his hand on the various vessels) which could only be done in the attitude of standing. This being, in their Lordships' opinion, the proper construction of the Rubric, it is clear that the respondent, by the posture or change of posture which he has adopted during the prayer, has violated the Rubric, and committed an offence within the meaning of the 13th and 14th of Charles II., c. 4, s. 2, 17, 24, taken in connexion with the 1st of Elizabeth, c. 2, and punishable by admonition under section 23 of the latter statute. It was contended on behalf of the respondent that the act complained of was one of those minute details which could not be taken to be covered by the provisions of the Rubric; that the Rubric could not be considered as exhaustive in its directions, for no order could be shown in it requiring the celebrating minister to kneel while himself receiving the bread and wine; and that there was no charge or evidence against the respondent that in kneeling after the consecration any adoration of the Sacrament was intended. Their Lordships are of opinion that it is not open to a minister of the Church, or even to their Lordships in advising her Majesty, as the highest ecclesiastical tribunal of appeal, to draw a distinction in acts which are a departure from or violation of the Rubric, and between those which are important and those which appear to be trivial. The object of a Statute of Uniformity is, as its preamble expresses, to produce 'an universal agreement in the public worship of Almighty God,' an object which would be wholly frustrated if each minister on his own view of the relative importance of the details of the service, were to be at liberty to omit, to add to, or to alter any of those details. The rule upon this subject has been already laid down by the Judicial Committee in '*Westerton v. Liddell*,' and their Lordships are disposed entirely to adhere to it:—'In the performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the Prayer Book, the directions contained in it must be strictly observed; no omission and no addition can be permitted. There would, indeed, be no difficulty in showing that the posture of the celebrating minister during all parts of the Communion Service was, and that for obvious reasons, deemed to be of no small importance in the changes introduced into the Prayer Book at and after the Reformation. The various stages of the service are, as has already been shown, fenced and guarded by directions of the most minute kind as to standing and kneeling, the former attitude being prescribed even for prayers, during which a direction to kneel might have been

expected. And it is not immaterial to observe, that whereas in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. there was contained at the end a Rubric in these words, 'As touching, kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures, they may be used or left, as every man's devotion serveth, without blame,' this Rubric was in the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. and in all the subsequent Prayer Books omitted. The argument against the completeness of the directions as to posture, derived from a supposed absence of any order that the celebrant shall kneel while himself receiving, does not appear to their Lordships to be well founded. In the Rubric as to the reception of the sacramental bread and wine, the words 'all meekly kneeling' apply, as their Lordships think, to the celebrant, as well as to other clerks and to the people; and this is made more clear by the Rubric termed the Black Rubric added at the end of the service. It is true, as was contended, that there is no charge against the respondent that the kneeling complained of was intended as an act of adoration of the sacramental elements. Such a charge, involving as it would an inquiry into sentiments and feelings, of which no tribunal can adequately judge, would be difficult of proof; and the Rubrical enactments appear to have been wisely confined to prescribing an order of service free from those outward movements which had become more or less associated with errors in doctrine which, at the Reformation, were renounced. If this order is departed from, it is, as their Lordships think, unnecessary to inquire into the motive by which the departure has been occasioned. Another argument urged on behalf of the respondent should also be noticed. It was contended with great ability that the charge as to kneeling during the Prayer of Consecration was made in connexion with the charge as to the elevation of the sacrament, and the charge of kneeling was only an aggravation of that of elevation, which had been discontinued. This, no doubt, is so; but the kneeling under the circumstances described, being itself, as their Lordships think it is, a violation of the Rubric, they do not think that the judgment of the Court should the less be passed upon it because the other part of the charge—namely, that as to the elevation—is no longer resisted. It only remains on this part of the case to advert to the very learned and elaborate judgment of the Dean of the Arches. That learned Judge states that the Rubric does not give precise directions that the celebrant should kneel at the times when it appears that the respondent does kneel; that he is far from saying it is not legally competent to him to adopt this attitude of devotion; and that it cannot be contended that at some time or other he must not kneel during the celebration, although no directions as to his kneeling at all are given by the Rubric. Their Lordships, however, think, as they read the Rubric, that directions as to the celebrant kneeling at a particular time of the celebration—namely, when he himself receives the Sacrament—are given, and at the time when it appears that the respondent kneels—namely, during the Prayer of Consecration—the directions in the Rubric are precise that he should stand and ~~not~~ kneel. The learned Judge further observes that if Mr. Mackonochie has committed any error in this respect, it is one which should not form the subject of a criminal prosecution, but belongs to the category of cases which should be referred to the Bishop. This category the learned Judge had previously defined to be 'Things neither ordered nor prohibited expressly or by implication, but the doing or use of which must be governed by the living discretion of some person in authority.' And as to cases in this category, the learned Judge considered that, according to the Preface to the Prayer Book, 'the parties that doubt or diversely take

any thing should always resort to the Bishop of the diocese.' Their Lordships do not think it necessary to consider minutely the cases to which, or the manner in which, this direction in the Preface to the Prayer Book is applicable, inasmuch as in their opinion the charge against the respondent, with which they are now dealing, involves what is expressly ordered and prohibited by the Rubric, and is, therefore, a matter in which the Bishop could have no jurisdiction to modify or dispense with the Rubrical provisions. On the whole, their Lordships are of opinion that the charge against the respondent of kneeling during the Prayer of Consecration has been sustained, and that he should be admonished, not only not to recur to the elevation of the paten and the cup as pleaded in the 3rd article, but also to abstain for the future from kneeling or prostrating himself before the consecrated elements during the Prayer of Consecration, as in the same article also pleaded. The other charge involved in this appeal is that of using lighted candles on the Communion-table during the celebration of the Holy Communion when such candles are not wanted for the purpose of giving light. This charge is contained in the 5th and 6th articles, which are as follow:—

“5. That the said Alexander Heriot Mackonochie has in his said church, and within two years last past—to wit, on Sunday the 23rd day of December, on Christmas-day last past, on Sunday, the 30th day of December, all in the year of our Lord 1866, and on Sunday, the 13th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1867, used lighted candles on the Communion-table during the celebration of the Holy Communion at times when such lighted candles were not wanted for the purpose of giving light, and permitted and sanctioned such use of lighted candles. 6. That the use of such lighted candles is an unlawful addition to and variation from the form and order prescribed and appointed by the said statutes, and by the said Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, and is contrary to the said statutes and to the 14th, 36th, and 38th of the said constitutions and canons.’

“The responsive plea of Mr. Mackonochie on this head is as follows:—

“5. Whereas it is pleaded in the 5th article that the said Alexander Heriot Mackonochie has in his said church, and in within two years last—to wit, on Sunday the 23rd day of December, on Christmas-day last past, and on Sunday, the 30th day of December, all in the year of our Lord 1866; and on Sunday the 13th of January, in the year of our Lord 1867, used lighted candles on the Communion table during the celebration of the Holy Communion at times when such lighted candles were not wanted for the purpose of giving light, and permitted and sanctioned such use of lighted candles. Now, the same is in part untruly pleaded, for the party proponent alleges that on the said three Sundays and Christmas-day, in the said 5th article mentioned, the said lighted candles were not placed on the Communion-table, but upon a narrow movable ledge of wood resting on the said table, and that the said candles were so placed and kept lighted, not during the celebration of the Holy Communion only, as falsely suggested in the said 5th article, but also during the whole of the reading of the Communion Service, including the Epistle and Gospel, and during the singing after the reading of the Nicene Creed, and during the delivery of the sermon. 6. That he denies that the use of such lighted candles is an unlawful addition to and variation from the form and order prescribed and appointed by the said statutes, and by the said Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, and is contrary to the said statutes, and to the 14th, 36th, and 38th of the said constitutions and canons, as in the said 6th article alleged.’

"The facts, therefore, on this part of the case appear to be that the respondent uses two lighted candles during, with reference to, and as an accompaniment of, the Communion Service, and not for the ordinary purpose of giving light, and that these candles are placed on a ledge of wood which is placed on the Communion-table. The Dean of the Arches seems to have considered that all the practices complained of before him, including this use of lighted candles, were ceremonies. The respondent, in the argument of his counsel at the bar, appeared to prefer to treat the question as one of ornament, and his counsel said he considered the lighted candles 'part of the symbolical decoration of the altar.' If it were necessary to decide which of these views is correct, their Lordships would feel disposed to agree with the Dean of the Arches that, however candles and candlesticks may, *per se*, be looked upon as a part of the furniture or ornaments of the church, taking the word ornaments in the larger sense assigned to it by this Committee in '*Westerton v. Liddell*' (*Moore*, p. 156), yet the lighting of the candles and the consuming them by burning throughout, and with reference to a service in which they are to act as symbols and illustrations, is itself either a ceremony or else a ceremonial act forming part of a ceremony, and making the whole ceremony a different one from what it would have been had the lights been omitted. The Council of Trent (22nd Session, 5th chapter), *De Missæ Ceremoniis et Ritibus*, says, 'Ceremonias item adhibuit ut mysticas benedictiones, lumina, thymiamata, vestes, alique multa.' Dr. Donne also in his '*Sermons*' (p. 80, fol. ed. 1640), writing in support of the use of these lights, calls it a ceremony. He says, 'It is in this ceremony of lights as it is in other ceremonies.' There is a clear and obvious distinction between the presence in the Church of things inert and unused, and the active use of the same things as a part of the administration of a sacrament or of a ceremony. Incense, water, a banner, a torch, a candle and candlestick, may be parts of the furniture or ornaments of a church; but the censuring of persons and things, or, as was said by the Dean of Arches, the bringing in incense at the beginning or during the celebration, and removing it at the close of the celebration of the Eucharist, the symbolical use of water in baptism, or its ceremonial mixing with the sacramental wine; the waving or carrying the banner; the lighting, cremation, and symbolical use of the torch or candle;—these acts give a life and meaning to what is otherwise inexpressive, and the act must be justified, if at all, as part of a ceremonial law. If the use of lighted candles in the manner complained of be a ceremony or ceremonial act, it might be sufficient to say that it is not—nor is any ceremony in which it forms a part—among those retained in the Prayer Book, and it must therefore be included among those that are abolished; for the Prayer Book, in the Preface, divides all ceremonies into these two classes—those which are retained are specified, whereas none are abolished specifically or by name, but it is assumed that all are abolished which are not expressly retained. Passing, however, from this, the use of lighted candles, if a ceremonial act or part of a ceremony, would be prohibited by Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, section 4, which is now applicable to the present Prayer Book, and which makes it penal to use any other rite, ceremony, order, form, or manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper . . . than is mentioned and set forth in the said book; and any prior authority for the practice, from usage or otherwise, would be avoided by section 27, which enacts that 'all laws, statutes, and ordinances whereby any other service, administration of sacraments, or common prayer is limited, established, or set forth to be used within this realm,

shall from henceforth be utterly void and of none effect.' As to the argument that the use complained of is at most only part of a ceremony, their Lordships are of opinion that when a part of a ceremony is changed the integrity of the ceremony is broken, and it ceases to be the same ceremony. The learned Judge of the Arches' Court was of opinion that these lights were ordered by injunctions having statutable authority, which injunctions had not been directly repealed; that they were primitive and Catholic in their origin, Evangelical in their proper symbolism, purged from all superstition and novelty by the very terms of the injunction which ordered their retention in the church, and that, therefore, it was lawful to place them on the Holy Table during the time of the Holy Communion 'for the signification that Christ is the very true Light of the world.' The authorities cited show beyond all doubt the very ancient and general use in the Church of these symbolical lights; and the injunction to which the learned Judge refers is the third of those issued, A.D. 1547, in the first year of the reign of King Edward VI. By this it was ordered that images should be taken down and destroyed, and that spiritual persons should suffer no torches or candles to be set afore any image or picture, but only two lights upon the high altar, before the sacrament, which, for the signification that Christ is the very true Light of the world, they should suffer to remain. It would deserve consideration how far under any circumstances this injunction could now be held operative, having regard to the words, 'upon the high altar, before the sacrament,' and to the distinction pointed out by this Court in '*Westerton v. Liddell*' (*Moore*, 176, 184), and '*Parker v. Leach*' (2 *Moore*, N. S., 199), between the sacrificial altar and the Communion-table. But without dwelling on this, and without stopping at this place to inquire into the nature of the authority under which the injunctions of 1547 were issued, their Lordships are clearly of opinion that the injunction in question, so far as it could be taken to authorize the use of lights as a ceremony or ceremonial act, was abrogated or repealed by the Act the 1st of Elizabeth, c. 2, particularly by section 27 already mentioned, and by the present Prayer Book and Act of Uniformity, and that the use of lighted candles, viewed as a ceremony or ceremonial act, can derive no warrant from that injunction. Reference was made in the argument for the respondent to a constitution of the Council of Oxford, under Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1322. That constitution is in these words:—'*Tempore quo missarum solennia peraguntur, accenduntur duæ candelæ vel ad minus una;*' and is apparently a repetition of the earlier constitution of A.D. 1222 (*Wilkins' Concilia*, Vol. i., p. 595):—'*Tempore quo missarum solennia peraguntur, accenduntur duæ candelæ, vel ad minus una cum lampade.*' As to these constitutions it is sufficient to say that, in their Lordships' opinion, they must be taken, if of force at the time of passing of any of the Acts of Uniformity, to have been repealed by those Acts. It remains to be considered whether the use of these two lighted candles can be justified as a question of 'ornaments' according to the definition of that term already referred to. It was in this sense that the argument for the respondent appeared to prefer to regard them; and the learned Judge of the Arches' Court also, although, at the earlier part of his judgment, he had stated that the matters complained of before him must be considered as 'ceremonies,' appears ultimately to have applied to the use of the lighted candles the law or Rubric as to ornaments. The Rubric or note as to ornaments, in the commencement of the Prayer Book, is in these words:—'And here it is to be noted that such

ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.' The construction of this Rubric was very fully considered by this Court in the case of *Westerton v. Liddell* already referred to; and the propositions which their Lordships understand to have been established by the judgment in that case may thus be settled:—1. The words 'authority of Parliament,' in the Rubric, refer to and mean the Act of Parliament 2nd and 3rd Edward VI., c. 1, giving Parliamentary effect to the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., and do not refer to or mean canons or royal injunctions, having the authority of Parliament, made at an earlier period (*Moore*, p. 160). 2. The term 'ornaments' in the Rubric means those articles the use of which in the services and ministrations of the Church is prescribed by that Prayer Book (*Ibid.* p. 156). 3. The term 'ornaments' is confined to these articles (*Ibid.* p. 156). 4. Though there may be articles not expressly mentioned in the Rubric the use of which would not be restrained, they must be articles which are consistent with and subsidiary to the services, as an organ for the singing, a Credence-table from which to take the sacramental bread and wine, cushions, hassocks, &c. (*Ibid.*) In these conclusions, and in this construction of the Rubric, their Lordships entirely concur, and they go far, in their Lordships' opinion, to decide this part of the case. The lighted candles are clearly not 'ornaments' within the words of the Rubric, for they are not prescribed by the authority of Parliament therein mentioned—namely, the first Prayer Book; nor is the injunction of 1547 the authority of Parliament within the meaning of the Rubric. They are not subsidiary to the service, for they do not aid or facilitate—much less are they necessary to the service; nor can a separate and independent ornament previously in use be said to be consistent with a Rubric which is silent as to it, and which by necessary implication abolishes what it does not retain. It was strongly pressed by the respondent's counsel that the use of lighted candles up to the time of the issue of the first Prayer Book was clearly legal; that the lighted candles were in use in the Church in the second year of Edward VI., and that there was nothing in the Prayer Book of that year making it unlawful to continue them. All this may be conceded, but it is in reality beside the question. The Rubric of our Prayer Book might have said, those ornaments shall be retained which were lawful, or which were in use in the second year of Edward VI., and the argument as to actual use at the time, and as to the weight of the injunction of 1547, might in that case have been material. But the Rubric, speaking in 1561, more than 100 years subsequently, has, for reasons which it is not the province of a judicial tribunal to criticize, defined the class of ornaments to be retained by a reference, not to what was in use *de facto*, or to what was lawful in 1549, but to what was in the Church by authority of Parliament in that year: and in the Parliamentary authority which this Committee has held, and which their Lordships hold to be indicated by these words, the ornaments in question are not found to be included. Their Lordships have not referred to the usage as to lights during the last 300 years; but they are of opinion that the very general disuse of lights after the Reformation (whatever exceptional cases to the contrary might be produced), contrasted with their normal and prescribed use previously, affords a very strong contemporaneous and continuous exposition of the law upon the subject. Their Lordships will, therefore, humbly advise her Majesty that the charge as to lights also has been sustained, and that the respondent should be admonished

for the future to abstain from the use of them, as pleaded in these articles. All the charges against the respondent having been thus established, their Lordships see no reason why the usual consequence as to costs should not follow ; and they will advise her Majesty that the respondent should pay to the appellant the costs in the court below and of this appeal."

APPENDIX.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS AND STATE PAPERS.

LAWS OF NATURALIZATION AND ALLEGIANCE.

Report of the Royal Commissioners for inquiring into the Laws of Naturalization and Allegiance.

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

WE, Your Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Laws of Naturalization and Allegiance, have to state that, in compliance with the terms of your Majesty's Commission, we have inquired into the legal condition of natural-born British subjects who may depart from and reside beyond the realm in foreign countries, and have considered how and in what manner, having regard to the laws and practice of other States, it may be expedient to alter and amend the laws relating to such natural-born subjects, their wives, children, descendants, or relatives. We have also inquired into the legal condition of persons, being aliens, entering into or residing within the realm and becoming naturalized as subjects of the Crown, and have considered how far and in what manner it may be expedient, having regard to the laws and practice of this country, of Foreign States, or otherwise, to alter or amend the laws relating to such persons, or persons claiming rights or privileges through or under them.

We have found it necessary, in order to deal satisfactorily with the matters referred to us, to enter into some others bearing closely on them but not embraced within the express terms of your Majesty's Commission; and on these latter, as well as on the former, we have thought it right to submit to your Majesty the conclusions to which we have been led.

We now humbly lay before your Majesty the following report :—

I.

There are two classes of persons who by our law are deemed to be natural-born British subjects :—

1. Those who are such from the fact of their having been born within the dominion of the British Crown ;
2. Those who, though born out of the dominion of the British Crown, are by various general Acts of Parliament declared to be natural-born British subjects.

The allegiance of a natural-born British subject is regarded by the Common Law as indelible.

We are of opinion that this doctrine of the Common Law is neither reasonable nor convenient. It is at variance with those principles on which the rights and duties of a subject should be deemed to rest; it conflicts with that freedom of action which is now recognized as most conducive to the general good as well as to individual happiness and prosperity; and it is especially inconsistent with the practice of a State which allows to its subjects absolute freedom of emigration. It is inexpedient that British law should maintain in theory, or should by foreign nations be supposed to maintain in practice, any obligations which it cannot enforce and ought not to enforce if it could; and it is unfit that a country should remain subject to claims for protection on the part of persons who, so far

as in them lies, have severed their connexion with it.

We accordingly submit to your Majesty the following Recommendations for an amendment of the law in this respect.

1. Any British subject, who, being resident in a foreign country, shall be naturalized therein and shall undertake, according to its laws, the duty of allegiance to the Foreign State as a subject or citizen thereof, should, upon such naturalization, cease to be a British subject.

2. The principle of this rule should be applied to a woman who, being a British subject, shall become by marriage with an alien the subject or citizen of a Foreign State.

3. The wife of a British subject who shall become naturalized abroad, and his children, if under the age of twenty-one years at the date of his naturalization, should likewise cease to be British subjects from that date; but this rule should not include a wife or child who has not emigrated to the country of naturalization, nor should it operate unless, according to the local law, the naturalization of the husband or father has naturalized also the wife or child.

4. Naturalization in a foreign country, though operating from the time of its completion as an extinguishment of the original citizenship, should not carry with it discharge from responsibility for acts done before the new allegiance was acquired.

Provision should be made for applying the same principles to the case of British subjects who have become so by naturalization.

We have considered the question whether the acquisition of a foreign domicile, or a certain length of residence abroad, should divest a person of British nationality. We have not been able to satisfy ourselves that either continued residence or domicile could be practically adopted as a rule to determine the allegiance of the subject, having regard to the difficulties which attend the definition of domicile and proof of the fact, and also to the great diversity of circumstances under which men reside in foreign countries.

II.

It is expedient that the foregoing recommendations should be applied to British subjects already naturalized in foreign countries, as well as to those who may hereafter become so. A certain period, however, not less than two years, should be allowed, within which any person already so naturalized (that is, before the proposed alteration of the law is made)

might declare his desire to remain a British subject. The mode in which this should be done might be settled reciprocally by Treaty or otherwise with such foreign Governments as were willing to permit it to operate as an extinguishment of the acquired allegiance. In the absence of such an agreement, the naturalized person might make a formal declaration of such his desire, if resident abroad, before a British Minister or consul, or, if within your Majesty's dominions, before a Justice of Peace, such declaration to be registered or recorded in such manner as might be judged expedient, in the United Kingdom by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in a colony by the Governor or other chief officer of the Government. Any person thus electing within the prescribed period to remain a British subject should be deemed to retain his British nationality, and the benefit of this election should extend to his wife, and to his children if under age at the time; but the election should not (unless permitted by the State of his naturalization to extinguish his acquired allegiance) entitle him or them to claim any British privileges when within the territories of that State.

These provisions should be deemed to apply to women already naturalized abroad by marriage with an alien or by the foreign naturalization of their husbands, and to children already naturalized abroad by the foreign naturalization of their fathers. Such women, becoming or having become widows, and such children, attaining or having attained the age of twenty-one years, should be enabled to retain their British nationality by exercising a like option at any time before the expiration of the period to be limited as aforesaid.

Persons already naturalized abroad who might not exercise this option within the prescribed period would be able at any time afterwards to regain British nationality in the mode pointed out in a subsequent part of this report.

III.

The above recommendations, if carried into effect, would impose the condition of aliens upon many persons who have hitherto enjoyed the legal rights proper to British subjects. It was necessary, therefore, to consider what effect the deprivation of such rights would have upon those affected by the change. And here it was impossible to overlook the serious question raised by the existence of those disabilities which (subject to certain limitations) attach by law to aliens in respect to the holding and inheritance of real estate in the United Kingdom.

Those disabilities have hitherto only affected persons who had never been regarded by the law as natural-born British subjects, such persons alone coming within the legal definitions of aliens. But when it is proposed to bring within the same category a new class of persons who, having been originally British subjects, are for the future to lose that character, different considerations arise. To deprive persons, already naturalized abroad, who now enjoy the right of holding and inheriting lands, of that right, might be thought harsh, if not unjust. In the case of those who may become so naturalized hereafter, the same objection would not arise; but even here the penalty of exclusion from possible rights of inheritance appears to be an impolitic restriction on the liberty of emigration.

We have to choose, then, between two courses; one is, to maintain the existing disabilities, making special provision for the new class of cases to which our recommendations would give rise; the other, to abrogate the disabilities altogether in respect of all classes of aliens.

The first course, viz. that of making special provision for expatriated British subjects who will now become aliens, whilst it would break in upon the general principle, might in practice be productive of embarrassment and litigation. We have accordingly considered the other course. The question whether aliens ought any longer to be prohibited by our law from holding landed property within the realm has not, indeed, been expressly referred to us by the terms of your Majesty's Commission; but we have found it impossible to deal with the position of those who, under the terms of our previous Recommendations, will cease to be British subjects, without forming an opinion as to the position of aliens generally in this respect.

We think it right to point out that not only can aliens hold real estate in France and many other European countries, but they are also enabled by colonial enactments to hold real estate in the Dominion of Canada (except New Brunswick), British Columbia, Cape of Good Hope, Natal, Queensland, Victoria, South Australia, St. Kitts, and Hong Kong, while the regulations prohibiting aliens from possessing real estate have recently been repealed in Bengal, and are now, under revision in Madras and Bombay.

By the Act of 1844 (7 & 8 Vict. c. 66), "every alien now residing in, or who shall hereafter come to reside in, any part of the United Kingdom, and being the subject of a friendly State, may, by grant, lease, demise, assignment, bequest, representation, or otherwise, take and hold any

lands, houses, or other tenements, for the purpose of residence or of occupation by him or her, or his or her servants, or for the purpose of any business, trade, or manufacture, for any term of years not exceeding twenty-one years, as fully and effectually, to all intents and purposes, and with the same rights, remedies, exemptions, and privileges, except the right to vote at elections for members of Parliament, as if he were a natural-born subject of the United Kingdom."

This term of twenty-one years may, of course, be renewed.

We have arrived at the conclusion that the rule are either untenable in themselves or have ceased to be applicable; and we are prepared therefore, instead of making any distinction between the two classes of aliens, to recommend that the present disabilities of alienage in respect of the holding and inheritance of land should be abolished altogether.

It has been suggested that, in time of war, danger might occasionally arise from the possession of land by aliens. We think it sufficient to say that this is a danger against which, should it be deemed serious enough to demand special legislation, it would not be difficult to guard.

IV.

In considering whether the character of a natural-born British subject should be regarded as indelible, and, if not, how it should be lost, we have found it necessary to consider also whether any changes should be made in the laws which determine what classes of persons should be deemed to possess that character.

There are two classes with respect to whom this question may be raised. They are—

1. Persons of foreign parentage born within the dominions of the Crown;
2. Persons of British parentage born abroad.

All persons, of whatever parentage, born within the dominions and allegiance of the Crown, are by the Common Law natural-born British subjects. All persons, on the other hand, of whatever parentage, born beyond its dominions and out of its allegiance, were by the Common Law regarded as aliens.

By various statutes it has been enacted as follows:—

25. Edw. III. stat. 2: "All children inheritors, which henceforth shall be born out of the allegiance of the king, whose fathers and mothers at the time of their birth be and shall be at the faith and allegiance of the king of England, shall

have and enjoy the same benefit and advantage, to have and bear inheritance within the same allegiance as the other inheritors aforesaid in time to come: so always that the mothers of such children passed the sea by the licence and will of their husbands."

7 Anne, c. 5: "The children of all natural-born subjects, born out of the allegiance of her Majesty, her heirs and successors, shall be deemed, adjudged, and taken to be natural-born subjects of this kingdom, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever."

4 Geo. II. c. 21: "And whereas some doubts have arisen upon the construction of the said recited clause in the said Act of the seventh year of her late Majesty's reign: now for the explaining the said recited clause in the said Act, relating to children of natural-born subjects, and to prevent any disputes touching the true intent and meaning thereof, be it enacted, that all children born out of the allegiance of the Crown of England or of Great Britain, or which shall hereafter be born out of such allegiance, whose fathers were or shall be natural-born subjects of the Crown of England, or of Great Britain, at the time of the birth of such children respectively, shall and may be adjudged and taken to be natural-born subjects of the Crown of Great Britain, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever."

13 Geo. III. cap. 21: "All persons born, or who hereafter shall be born, out of the allegiance of the Crown of England or of Great Britain, whose fathers were or shall be by virtue of a statute made in the fourth year of King George II. to explain a clause in an Act made in the seventh year of the reign of her Majesty Queen Anne, for naturalizing foreign Protestants, which relates to the natural-born subjects of the Crown of England or of Great Britain, entitled to all the rights and privileges of natural-born subjects of the Crown of England or of Great Britain, shall and may be adjudged and taken to be, and are hereby declared and enacted to be, natural-born subjects of the Crown of Great Britain, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever, as if he and they had been and were born in this kingdom."

Without entering into any discussion on the construction of these statutes, we think it right to state that, so far as we are aware, no attempt has ever been made on the part of the British Government (unless in Eastern countries where special jurisdiction is conceded by Treaty), to enforce claims upon, or to assert rights in respect of, persons born abroad as against the country of their birth whilst they were resident therein, and when by

its law they were invested with its nationality.

A rule corresponding to that of the English Common Law has been retained by the United States. Every person born within the limits and jurisdiction of the United States is an American citizen by American law. But it is also provided by an Act of Congress passed in 1855 that, "Persons heretofore born, or hereafter to be born, out of the limits of the jurisdiction of the United States, whose fathers were or shall be at the time of their birth citizens of the United States, shall be deemed and considered, and are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States: provided, however, that the rights of citizenship shall not descend to persons whose fathers never resided in the United States."

By the Code Napoléon (Art. 10), "Tout Français né d'un Français en pays étranger est Français." As to children born in France, they were under the Code French if their fathers were French, aliens if their fathers were aliens, but with a right in the latter case to claim French citizenship on making a declaration and fixing their domicile in France. An exception has been introduced, however, by a law passed in 1851, by which, if the alien father were also born in France, the child is deemed French, but is at liberty to claim the status of an alien on attaining twenty-one years of age.

The Prussian law of 1842 declares that "Every legitimate child of a Prussian subject is by birth a Prussian subject, even though born in a foreign country."

Of these two tests of nationality—the place of birth and the nationality of the father—neither is at present adopted without qualification by British, French, or American law. The laws of these countries exhibit, in fact, different combinations of the two, Great Britain and the United States laying chief stress on the place of birth, whilst in France the father's nationality determines, though not absolutely and in all cases, that of the child; and this latter theory has found acceptance among other European nations.

The rule which impresses on persons born within your Majesty's dominions the character of British subjects is open to some theoretical and some practical objections, of the force of which we are aware. But it has, on the other hand, solid advantages. It selects as the test a fact readily provable; and this, in questions of nationality and allegiance, is a point of material consequence. It prevents troublesome questions in cases (numerous in some parts of the British empire), where the father's nationality is uncertain; and it

has the effect of obliterating speedily and effectually disabilities of race, the existence of which within any community is generally an evil, though to some extent a necessary evil. Lastly, we believe that of the children of foreign parents, born within the dominions of the Crown, a large majority would, if they were called upon to choose, elect British nationality. The balance of convenience, therefore, is in favour of treating them as British subjects, unless they disclaim that character, rather than of treating them as aliens unless they claim it. The former course is, of the two, the less likely to inflict needless trouble and disappoint natural expectations.

We do not therefore recommend the abandonment of this rule of the common law, but we are clearly of opinion that it ought not to be, as it now is, absolute and unbending. In the case of children of foreign parentage, it should operate only where a foreign nationality has not been chosen. Where such a choice has been made, it should give way.

As to the second class—persons of British parentage born abroad—we think it expedient that the statutes now in force should be repealed, in order to introduce some limitations, and place the law on a clearer and more satisfactory basis. Birth abroad is often merely accidental, while of those British subjects who go to reside in foreign countries a great number certainly prize British nationality for themselves, and wish that it should be enjoyed by their children. The law, as it stands, concedes this benefit to their children born abroad; and we do not recommend that it should be withdrawn; but we think that the transmission of British nationality in families settled abroad should be limited to the first generation.

The following recommendations embody the conclusions which we have formed on this branch of the subject:—

1. As to persons born within the dominions of the Crown:

(a) All persons born within the dominions of the Crown should be regarded by British law as British subjects by birth, except children born of alien fathers and registered as aliens.

(b) Provision should be made for enabling children, born within the dominions of the Crown, of alien fathers, to be registered as aliens; and children so registered should be thenceforth regarded as aliens. The child, if not so registered on his birth or during his minority by his father or guardian, should be permitted to register himself as an alien at any time before he has exercised or claimed

any right or privilege as a British subject.

(c) If the father, being an alien when the child was born, becomes during the child's minority naturalized as a British subject, the child, though registered as an alien, should follow the condition of the father.

2. As to persons born out of the dominions of the Crown:

(a) Every child born out of the dominions of the Crown whose father at the time of the birth was a British subject, should be regarded by British law as by birth a British subject, provided the father were born within the dominions of the Crown, but not otherwise.

(b) Provided that any such person as aforesaid who according to the law of a foreign country is a subject or citizen of that country, and who has never exercised or claimed any right or privilege as a British subject, should in the administration of British criminal law be treated as a subject of the country in which he was born.

(c) And if any such person, charged with a criminal offence for which an alien would not be liable to be tried, should successfully defend himself on the ground that he was not, in respect of the act alleged, amenable as a British subject to the criminal law of this country, he should be thenceforth to all intents and purposes an alien.

(d) If before the child's birth the father had become naturalized in the foreign country he would, under our previous recommendations, have ceased to be a British subject. If he should become so naturalized during the child's minority, the child born abroad should follow the condition of the father.

(e) By the Statute 12 and 13 Vict. c. 68, provision is now made for the registration at British consulates abroad of marriages of British subjects celebrated abroad; and official copies of such registers are made evidence in the courts of this country. We think that a similar system of registry, with the like legal effect, should be adopted for the purpose of procuring evidence (as far as practicable) of births and deaths of British subjects abroad, due provision being made for securing the accuracy of such registration; and we further recommend that such registries should be established in all British legations as well as consulates.

The above recommendations, in so far

as they may be inconsistent with the present law or practice of this country, are not intended to apply to children born of British fathers within the dominions of the Ottoman Porte, China, Japan, or other countries with which Great Britain may have special Treaties for exclusive jurisdiction, nor any part of Asia or Africa not the possession of some civilized State. As to such children we contemplate no alteration in the existing law.

V.

We have considered the present practice of naturalization under the Act 7 and 8 Vict. c. 66. In dealing with this question we have desired to give effect to our opinion, that to be a British subject is a valuable privilege to be considerably imparted to those who desire its advantages, and are willing to undertake its duties. If aliens are, as we recommend, made capable of holding real estate, the considerations applicable to the question will be simplified; the inducement which now most commonly leads foreigners to apply for naturalization will be removed; the rights conferred by it will be political rights; and we think, on the one hand, that these rights should in no case be granted without the security which previous residence affords, and on the other, that when granted they should be full and complete. We recommend, therefore, that the Act should be amended so as to make a certain length of residence in the United Kingdom, or of service under the British Crown, to be proved to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State, a necessary condition of obtaining the privilege of naturalization; that, subject to this condition, the privilege should continue to be granted at the discretion of the Secretary of State; and that a person so naturalized should be thereupon entitled to all the rights and privileges of a natural-born British subject within the United Kingdom.

This alteration of the law, if made, will be incompatible with the continuance of the practice of issuing certificates of naturalization revocable or determinable if the naturalized person resides abroad for six months without the permission of the Secretary of State, a practice which in other respects appears to us to be open to serious objections.

VI.

We have previously stated our opinion that British-born subjects who have already been naturalized in foreign countries, should be allowed a period of not less than two years within which to resume their original nationality.

We further recommend that provision should be made to enable British-born subjects, who may at any time have lost their British nationality, to be readmitted to the privileges of British subjects by a system similar to that by which aliens are naturalized in this country, and on the same condition of a previous term of residence. Such persons should only be readmitted to British nationality at the discretion of one of her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State on addressing a memorial to the Secretary of State, setting forth the grounds on which they seek readmission, and their intention thenceforth to reside and settle within the British dominions. The Secretary of State might then, if he saw fit, and on being satisfied that the prescribed conditions were complied with, grant certificates readmitting the applicants to the rights and capacities of natural-born British subjects on their taking an oath of allegiance; but such certificates should not entitle the holders to British privileges within the country of their foreign naturalization, should they return thereto, unless according to its law they had ceased to be subjects or citizens of that country.

The wives, or children under twenty-one years of age, of persons so readmitted to British nationality, should also, if resident within the British dominions, be considered and taken to be British subjects from the date of that readmission, subject to the above reservation.

The same rule as to readmission should apply to women of British birth whose British nationality had been lost by marriage with an alien, on their becoming widows; but the children of such women born of an alien father should not by the readmission of the mother become naturalized as British subjects.

The foregoing provision will apply to the case of persons who shall desire to be readmitted within the United Kingdom to the privileges of British subjects.

It seems also desirable to make provision for the case of persons who, having lost their British character, may desire to be readmitted within the colonial dominions of the Crown to the advantages of British nationality.

In the case of an alien born, naturalization in the United Kingdom under the Act of 1844 does not confer any rights of nationality within the colonies (10 and 11 Vict. c. 83). On the other hand, colonial naturalization confers no rights of nationality beyond the limits of the colony granting naturalization.

The case of persons, however, who have lost their British nationality by force of such enactments as those which we recom-

mend will stand upon a different footing. When they are readmitted to British nationality within the United Kingdom they will also recover it in the colonies, since no colonial law has deprived them of their nationality.

We think it advisable that the Governors or chief officers in the colonies should have a similar power to readmit such persons to British nationality upon the same conditions as to residence and otherwise as those prescribed for readmission in the United Kingdom. Persons so readmitted will thereupon revert to their former rights, as in the case of readmission within the United Kingdom.

VII.

In the foregoing recommendations we have endeavoured to diminish the number of cases in which one who by British law is a British subject is regarded by foreign law as a foreign subject or citizen, and to obviate, as far as possible, the difficulties and inconveniences arising from such a double allegiance. But this, we are aware, cannot be done, otherwise than imperfectly, by British legislation alone; it requires the co-operation of foreign Governments and Legislatures.

If Great Britain renounces the doctrine of indelible allegiance, and acknowledges that British subjects can divest themselves of their nationality by foreign naturalization, it may be hoped that the same principles will be recognized by other countries with respect to aliens naturalized within the British dominions; and we accordingly recommend that efforts should be made to procure that reciprocity, as well as to secure to the children of British subjects born abroad, the same power of choosing their nationality, which it is proposed to confer on the children of alien parents born within British territory.

This might be effected by agreements or conventions concluded with different States separately; or better, perhaps, by means of a general understanding arrived at, in conference or otherwise, by the Powers most interested in the subject.

VIII.

Among other matters which have been brought under our notice, we have had occasion to remark the unsatisfactory results of the operation of the law enabling aliens to claim a jury *de medietate linguae*.

The mixed jury was instituted by Edward III. as an encouragement to foreign woollen merchants to resort to the English market (27 Edw. III. stat. 2. c. 3, and 28 Edw. III. c. 13).

The clauses of the statutes enacting it were confirmed by the Act 8 Hen. VI. c. 29, and by the last Act for consolidating and amending the laws relating to jurors and juries (6 Geo. IV. c. 50).

It is settled law that those members of a mixed jury who are foreigners need not be of the same nationality as the alien; they need not even speak the same language, but may each of them belong to a different nation and speak a different tongue.

We see no advantage in the maintenance of such a system, whilst the inconveniences which may arise from it are obvious; and we accordingly recommend that the statutes authorizing trials by mixed juries should be repealed.

We have not thought it necessary, in making these recommendations to enter into any general review of the subjects referred to us; as a full account of British and foreign laws, and of the diplomatic correspondence which has passed between your Majesty's Government, the Government of the United States, and other Governments is contained in the Memorandum by our secretary, Mr. Abbott, and other papers annexed to our Report.

CLARENDON.	(L.S.)
EDWARD CARDWELL.	(L.S.)
ROBERT PHILLIMORE.	(L.S.)
W. E. FORSTER.	(L.S.)
*G. BRAMWELL.	(L.S.)
TRAVERS TWISS.	(L.S.)
J. B. KARSLAKE.	(L.S.)
ROUNDELL PALMER.	(L.S.)
†W. VERNON HARCOURT.	(L.S.)
*M. BERNARD.	(L.S.)

CHARLES S. A. ABBOTT, Secretary.
February 20, 1869.

* We concur, except on one point, with the recommendations of the Report. As that point is important, we think it right to express our dissent, and to state, very briefly, the reasons on which it is founded.

The Report recommends (section IV., recommendations 1, *a. b.*) that the child born within the dominions of the British Crown of an alien father, should be regarded by British law as a British subject. This is the subsisting rule of the common law. A majority of the Commissioners think that it should be retained, but that provisions should be engrafted on it, which would enable such persons during minority or at any time afterwards to assume, by simple registration, the condition of aliens. We think otherwise, for the following reasons:—Such a law tends to produce, and must produce in many cases, that double allegiance which we all hold it desirable, as far as possible, to extinguish

(Report, section VII.). It is inconsistent in principle with the recommendation that the child born abroad of a British father, should be regarded by British law as a British subject. It is at variance with the law and practice of other European States. It agrees indeed with those of the United States of America; but this very agreement, if examined, will be found to be such as to make a conflict of claims between the two countries more probable. None of the duties of a British subject could practically be enforced against a person who, though born here, had always resided in the foreign country to which his father belonged. He could not, if he happened to be here, be justly made amenable to any duties other than such as the law imposes on all commorant foreigners. But he would, nevertheless, possess the rights of a subject, without having any real title to them. He might renounce indeed, if he pleased, his British allegiance. But why should he renounce that which might be a benefit to him, and could not be a burthen? If, on the other hand, he were regarded as an alien by birth, he could (provided he were resident here) obtain the advantages of British nationality by undertaking its obligations.

We do not dispute that the common law rule, which impresses British nationality at the moment of birth on all persons born on British soil, has arguments of some weight in its favour, nor that the substitution of a different rule would be attended by some inconveniences. But these inconveniences, which would rapidly diminish as the new rule became known and understood, do not in our judgment constitute a sufficient reason why, in deliberately revising our law on a matter which concerns foreigners as well as Englishmen, we should forego the great advantage of legislating on a consistent and generally accepted principle, and that principle one which is intrinsically reasonable and sound.

The qualification that, where the father, though an alien, was born here, the child, likewise born here, should be deemed a British subject, appears to us to limit conveniently the application of the principle, without substantially breaking in upon it. An analogous provision has been adopted in French law.

GEORGE W. W. BRAMWELL.
MOUNTAGUE BERNARD.

† Concurring as I do in the fundamental recommendation of the Report contained in its first section, I have thought it right to sign the Report.

I feel compelled, however, after the best

consideration I have been able to give to the subject, to dissent from the scheme contained in section IV. of the Report, for determining the nationality of children of foreign parents born within the realm.

Most persons will probably agree that the true rule for determining nationality, if it were practicable, would be found in the principle of domicile, i. e. that the home of a man's choice should also be the country of his allegiance; and indeed the Report asserts the soundness of this principle. The difficulty, however, of ascertaining the true domicile of a person resident in a foreign country, in the legal acceptance of that term, is a bar to its adoption in a case where it is requisite that the rule should be simple and obvious. Of all questions of law those which concern domicile are the most complicated and obscure, because they ultimately depend upon intention, which is necessarily of all things the most difficult to determine. We are driven, therefore, to adopt some less accurate but more practical rule, which shall approximate to, though it may not reach the same result.

In the case of persons born within British territory, of British parents, the presumption of British nationality and British domicile is of course conclusive. In the case of persons of British origin who have formally accepted a foreign naturalization, the presumption of change of domicile, and therefore of nationality, is sufficiently evidenced by the overt act of naturalization; and to such a condition of things the provisions of section I. of the Report apply themselves. Here the nationality follows distinctly the domicile which is clearly ascertained.

But there exist, further, two classes of cases with which section IV. of the Report deals, viz. (1) that of the children born of British parents abroad, and (2) that of the children of foreigners born in the dominions of the Crown. In these cases the real domicile may be said to be indeterminate, or at least ambiguous. For the British subject resident abroad or the foreigner resident in England may in either case desire to adhere to the domicile of his origin.

Hitherto, as is well known, by the common law of England, inherited rather than adopted by the United States, the nationality of such children has been determined solely by the locality of their birth. The inconveniences of this principle, where rigorously applied, have been universally recognized. The statute law of England and America has made provision to remedy its operation in the case of the children of their own subjects born abroad. Indeed the rule is wholly inclu-

fensible in principle. By the law of all modern nations the condition of the child primarily depends on that of the father. But the doctrine of deriving nationality from the locality of birth makes it depend on the accidental situation of the mother; and by this rule a child may become a subject of a country in which his father not only never made his home, but which he never even entered.

The rule of determining nationality by locality of birth was of purely feudal origin, and accordingly in the legislation of modern Europe since the French Revolution it has been discarded as the governing principle amongst continental nations. The Code Napoléon has adopted another principle; viz. that the nationality of the child should follow the nationality of the father, in the absence of any proof of an election on the part of the child to adopt the nationality of the country of his birth. This doctrine seems sound in principle. In the absence of naturalization by the father in the country of the birth of the child, there is no ostensible evidence of the desire of the father to change his domicile or his country. The nationality of the child ought not therefore to be altered whilst that of the father remains unchanged, except by some deliberate act of the child. That this principle is also convenient in its operation is proved by the fact that almost all continental States have in practice adopted the doctrine of the Code Napoléon; and, as has been mentioned above, it has been incorporated into the statute law of England and America in the case of their own subjects born abroad. That the Commissioners do not dissent from this rule is shown by the fact that in section IV. (§ 2) as to persons born of British fathers out of the dominions of the Crown, they recommend that the nationality of the child shall in the first instance be determined by that of the father.

But in the same section (section IV., § 1), in the case of children of foreign parents born within the realm, the Report proposes that the old rule of the locality of birth should *primá facie* prevail.

From this latter recommendation I dissent, and that for several reasons.

(1) If it is desirable to recast the doctrine of nationality by such extensive changes as those proposed in the Report, it seems expedient to found the whole system on some intelligible and self-consistent principle. It would be difficult to suggest any reason for adopting the rule by which the nationality of the father determines that of the child in the case of the children born of British

fathers abroad, which does not equally apply to the case of the children born of foreign fathers in England; and to lay down an opposite rule in the two cases seems not only indefensible in principle, but to be a course which, in respect of policy, is very likely to be misunderstood by foreign governments. If, whilst we assert that the child born of an Englishman abroad is a British subject, we also claim that the child born of a foreigner in England is likewise a British subject, it will be thought that acting for our own advantage on inconsistent principles we are grasping at the combined chances of a double event.

(2) It seems very desirable, as is stated in section VII. of the Report, to lay down some rule in which all or most States are likely to agree. Now the rule of determining the nationality of the child *primá facie* by that of the father is adopted by all States as regards the children born of their own subjects abroad. As regards the children of foreigners born in the realm, it is adopted by all States except England and America. It is obvious, therefore, that this is the rule by the adoption of which will be most readily obtained that consent of nations which on such a subject is of capital importance. It is stated in section VII. of the Report that "we have endeavoured to diminish the number of cases in which one who by British law is a British subject is regarded by foreign law as a foreign subject, and to obviate, as far as possible, the difficulties and inconveniences arising from a double allegiance." In that object I entirely concur; but it seems to me that it is not accomplished but rather defeated by laying down the rule that the child born of a foreigner in England is *primá facie* a British subject. In the view of every State (including the United States, so far as regards the children of born Americans in England) such person is a subject of the State of his father's origin; and therefore the proposed rule necessarily creates all the difficulties and inconveniences of a double allegiance. Assume, on the other hand, the rule, adopted by the Report in the case of the children born of British parents abroad, to be applied consistently to the case of the children born of foreign parents in England, it will be seen that the desired object will be completely accomplished. If the child B, of a foreigner A, is born in England, he would then be regarded by the English law as a foreigner; and so he would be regarded by all the world; and thus there would be no conflict of allegiance. Suppose A, the father, to become naturalized

in England, then B, the child, would be by English law a British subject, and cease to be the subject of the country of his father's origin; and so he would be regarded by all the world; assuming the United States to adopt (as we have reason to believe they would adopt) the principle laid down in section I. of the Report, viz. that foreign naturalization extinguishes the native allegiance. The same thing would occur if B were himself naturalized. And thus, by the adoption of a simple and consistent rule, we should lay the foundation of a general harmony in the doctrine and practice of nations which is not only of theoretical value, but of great practical consequence. For nothing would more solidly conduce to the peace of the world than that the same allegiance should be predicated of the same person by all governments.

(3) I am by no means insensible of the practical conveniences which may result in some cases from the adoption of the rule of the locality of birth, which are set forth in section IV. of the Report, but there appear to be grave disadvantages attendant on the rule which more than counteract them. Such a rule, as has been shown above, will have the effect of imposing the quality of British subjects, on a number of persons who neither seek nor desire it. It is true that the Report makes provision in the case of such persons for a machinery by which they may divest themselves of that character. Upon this it may be observed that a foreigner *in transitu* may, through ignorance or carelessness, omit to take measures which shall have the intended effect. But it is not necessary to urge this point, because in fact it would be as impossible in the future, as it has proved in the past, to insist against the will of the individual on his British character thus imposed by the mere accident of birth. The real evil to this country is of an exactly opposite character, viz. that by this rule persons are clothed with the character of British subjects, and become entitled to all its benefits, who have no real connexion with the community, and who ought to have no claims upon it. It is not probable that any foreigner accidentally resident in this country would disclaim the citizenship for his child which the law would confer, for the simple reason that the child would be enabled to take all the benefits, but could in no case be really made to fulfil the obligations of a British subject. Under this rule the child of a foreigner born here might return to his own country in his infancy, and he would thereafter possess, whenever he chose to claim them,

not only for himself, but (since he is a natural-born British subject) for his children also, all the benefits of the character of a British subject, whilst it is abundantly clear that neither he nor his children could ever be called upon to perform any of its duties. This is the practical mischief of the present rule, and to re-enact it would be to give fresh authority to a principle the inconvenience of which is sufficiently apparent. Nothing can be more politically inexpedient than that this country should be exposed to the claims of a class of persons who have no interest in its welfare, and who, neither by origin or domicile, have any community with its affairs.

On the other hand, in the case of foreigners and their children who really desire to incorporate themselves and their interests in the common stock of this country, and to embark their fortunes with ours, there seems neither hardship nor inconvenience in requiring that they should evidence their intention to change their nationality and adopt a new domicile by some formal act which, whilst it would establish their British nationality, would at the same time terminate their foreign allegiance. They would then no longer be able to blow hot and cold, and adopt in turn such nationality as happened for the moment to suit their interests. If the alien father is domiciled in England, and intends to cast in his lot and that of his family with this country, why should he object to naturalize himself or his child? But if he is unwilling by such an act to sever his connexion or that of his family with the country of his origin, why should we embarrass our relations with foreign States by conferring our nationality on such a person—to his advantage it may be, but certainly not in any respect to our own?

If the father and the child are really domiciled in this country, the process of naturalization would be simple and easy, and having regard to the recommendation in Section V. of the Report it will be seen that a person so naturalized will enjoy all the advantages which belong to a natural-born subject; if they are not so domiciled I venture to think the child ought not to acquire the privilege of British nationality by the simple accident of birth. The great importance of insisting on naturalization in such cases is, that it is by this means alone that the double allegiance can be avoided. For this purpose it is essential that the act which confers the new nationality should in itself openly and unambiguously terminate the old allegiance. This, the rule which requires naturalization of a foreigner

born in England as a condition of British nationality would do; whilst the rule conferring nationality by the mere fact of birth would give the new nationality without dissolving the old allegiance.

I should therefore propose that in the case of the children of foreigners born within the realm, the following rule should be adopted:—

“Children born within the realm of alien fathers who have been themselves born abroad, shall be deemed aliens. But such children shall become British subjects (1) upon the naturalization of their fathers, or (2) upon their being themselves naturalized either by their fathers during their minority or by themselves at full age.”

This rule would make the child born in this country, of an alien father also born in this country, a British subject by birth, and in this respect it accords with the French law. Though apparently somewhat in conflict with the general principle, it is in fact in strict conformity with the principle which makes domicile the governing rule of nationality; for though the presumption of domicile is very small from the mere fact of the place of birth of a single individual in one generation, it becomes very strong when the birth both of the father and the child takes place in the same country. Such a condition of things may be safely taken as a sufficient proof of permanent change of domicile and of the election of a new nationality, which could not be inferred from a solitary and isolated instance.

There is another point affecting the latter part of section IV. of the Report on which I feel great difficulty. Though I concur in the principle laid down in section IV. (§ 2 *a*) of the Report, by which it is declared that the children born of British fathers abroad “should be regarded by British law as British subjects,” I greatly doubt the expediency of the declaration in the same section (§ 2 *b*), that “in the administration of British criminal law” such children are under certain conditions not to be treated as British subjects. The word “subject,” in my understanding of the term, involves of necessity subjection to the laws of the State of which such person is a subject, and above all subjection to its criminal law. If it is necessary (though I think this is more than doubtful) to create a class of persons who shall be capable of all the privileges whilst they are liable

to none of the obligations of citizens, it would be desirable to discover for such a class some more appropriate title than that of “subjects.” What is no doubt intended is that such persons should have the capacity of becoming at their election British subjects, and that till they have exercised the option to enjoy the benefits, they shall not be called upon to bear the burthens of that character, but that after they have claimed the advantages they shall not be able to decline the obligations of subjects. But surely if this be the view which it is intended to present, it should be distinctly asserted that whilst the person is not amenable to the law of England he is not yet a British subject, and that as soon as he becomes a British subject he is at once amenable to that law. I cannot therefore assent to a definition which speaks of a person as “regarded by British law as by birth a British subject” (section IV. § 2 *a*), and of the same person, at the same time, under certain conditions, as a person “who in the administration of British criminal law should be treated as a subject of the country in which he was born” (section IV. § 2 *b*). The question of whether a particular individual who is thus declared a British subject is or is not amenable to our criminal law is made to turn upon the point of whether he has or not “ever exercised or claimed any right or privilege as a British subject.” I confess that in terms so general and vague there seems to me to lurk a dangerous ambiguity very intractable in the administration of criminal law. What are these “rights and privileges;” what is to be the extent of the “exercise” or the nature of the “claim” which by their absence or their presence are to sustain or to defeat the jurisdiction of the Crown over persons who are nominally British subjects? This distinction seems to constitute the same person a British subject by birth in the view of the English civil law, and to leave him an alien in the eye of the English criminal law. There may be persons against whom it is inexpedient that the rights of the Crown should be actually enforced in particular cases. But this is a very different thing from a formal declaration that there exist persons legally called “British subjects” who are not justiciable in the courts of the Queen.

W. VERNON HARCOURT.

1.—AN ACCOUNT OF THE GROSS PUBLIC INCOME OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND,

In the Year ended the 31st day of December, 1868, and of the actual Issues within the same period, exclusive of sums applied to the Redemption of Funded or paying off Unfunded Debt, and of the Advances and Repayments for Local Works, &c.

INCOME.			EXPENDITURE.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
Customs	.	.	Interest and Management of the Per-		
Excise	.	.	manent Debt	22,456,066	6 5
Stamps	.	.	Terminable Annuities	3,954,004	17 8
Taxes (Land and Assessed)	.	.	Interest of Exchequer Bonds	80,000	0 0
Property Tax	.	.	Interest of Exchequer Bills	112,046	0 0
Post Office	.	.	Interest on Bank Advances for Deficiency	5,703	5 0
Crown Lands (Net)	.	.	Interest on Bank Advances in Aid of		
			Ways and Means	3,879	9 0
					26,611,699 18 1
MISCELLANEOUS:—			CHARGES ON CONSOLIDATED FUND:—		
Military and Naval extra Receipts			Civil List	406,267	3 0
and proceeds of Old Stores sold			Annuities and Pensions	283,399	3 9
Amount received from the Reve-	974,753	17 6	Salaries and Allowances	140,940	15 10
nuces of India on account of the			Diplomatic Salaries and Pensions	167,123	4 4
Effective and Non-effective Charges			Courts of Justice	669,811	16 6
of British Troops serving in that			Miscellaneous Charges	191,467	15 5
Country	1,053,000	0 0			1,859,009 18 10
Allowance out of Profits of Issue re-			SUPPLY SERVICES:—		
ceived from the Bank of England,			Army	13,775,679	8 8
per Act 24 Vict., c. 3	138,578	0 0	Navy	11,701,872	13 9
Other Miscellaneous Receipts	1,010,345	15 2	Abyssinian Expedition	6,000,000	0 0
			Miscellaneous Civil Services	8,714,542	13 11
			Salaries, Superannuations, &c., of Cus-		
			tomans and Inland Revenue	2,574,954	4 8
			Ditto ditto of Post Office	2,431,003	13 10
			Packet Service	988,517	13 8
					45,186,570 8 6
Total Income.	£71,860,677	12 8			
Excess of Total Expenditure over			Total Ordinary Expenditure		
Income in the			£73,657,280 5 5		
year ended 31st December, 1868			Expenses of Fortifications provided for by Money raised per		
			Acts 28 & 29 Vict. c. 61, and 31 Vict. c. 145		
			425,000 0 0		
			Total Expenditure		
			£74,082,280 5 5		

2.—AN ACCOUNT OF THE BALANCES OF THE PUBLIC MONEY

Remaining in the Exchequer on the 31st day of December, 1867; the amount of Money raised by additions to the Funded or Unfunded Debt, and the amount applied towards the Redemption of Funded or Paying off Unfunded Debt in the Year ended the 31st day of December, 1868; the total amount of Advances and Repayments on account of Local Works, &c., in the same period; and the Balances in the Exchequer on the 31st day of December, 1868.

Balances in the Exchequer on the 31st December, 1867		£	s.	d.
At the Bank of England . . .	3,312,706	15	4	
At the Bank of Ireland	1,050,323	13	6	
Money raised in the Year ended 31st December, 1868 :—	4,363,030	8	10	
By the creation of Terminable Annuities, per Act 28 & 29 Vict. c. 61, and 30 & 31 Vict. c. 145 (to provide for the expense of constructing certain Fortifications), to expire on the 5th April, 1885, as follows:				
£ Annuity commencing 11 Oct. 1867	100,000	0	0	
16th Jan. 1868	7,751			
12th June " "	7,958			
12th Aug. " "	17,789			
UNFUNDED DEBT :—	425,000	0	0	
Exchequer Bonds, as follows :—				
Series N., per Act 30 Vict. c. 31, dated 27th March, 1868, and payable 27th March, 1870	1,000,000	0	0	
Series P., per Act 31 & 32 Vict. c. 27, dated 23rd September, 1868, and payable 23rd September, 1869	1,000,000	0	0	
Bank Advances in aid of Ways and Means, per Act 31 & 32 Vict. c. 85, s. 2, received in the quarter to 31st December, 1868, and repaid in the same quarter	2,000,000	0	0	
Repayments on account of Advances for the Purchase of Bullion, and for Local Works, &c.	1,000,000	0	0	
Repayments on acct. of Advances for New Courts of Justice	1,575,801	2	6	
Repayments on account of Advances for Greenwich Hospital	85,000	0	0	
	122,284	3	7	
No balance remaining of the Money raised for Fortifications.	£9,571,115	14	11	

Issued to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, to be applied to the Redemption of the Public Debt		£	s.	d.
Deduct—Amount applied in repayment of Bank Advances for Deficiency	228,956	17	0	
Exchequer Bonds paid off, viz. :—	228,956	17	0	
Series M., dated 27th March, 1866				1,000,000
Exchequer Bills paid off in Money				1,000
Bank Advances in aid of Ways and Means repaid				1,000,000
Advances for Purchase of Bullion, and for Local Works, &c.				1,413,459
Advances for New Courts of Justice				17
Advances for Greenwich Hospital				120,000
Excess of Total Expenditure over Income, in the Year ended 31st December, 1868				122,284
Balances in the Exchequer on the 31st December, 1868	2,221,603	12	9	
At the Bank of England . . .	42,606,084	12	5	
At the Bank of Ireland	1,086,684	9	1	
No balance remaining of the Money raised for Fortifications.	£9,571,115	14	11	

* No balance remaining of the Money raised for Fortifications.

Treasury Chambers, Whitehall, 14th January, 1869.

† No balance remaining of the Money raised for Fortifications.

ACTON S. AYRTON.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Jan. 11. The Hon. William Stuart, Secretary to Her Majesty's Embassy at St. Petersburg, to be Her Majesty's Minister Plenipotentiary to the Argentine Republic.

— 15. Sir Arthur Edward Kennedy, C.B. (late Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Island of Vancouver and its dependencies), to be Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the West Africa Settlements.

— 18. Captain Lord Frederick Herbert Kerr, R.N., to be one of the Grooms in Waiting in Ordinary to Her Majesty, in the room of Rear-Admiral Sir William Hoste, resigned.

— 28. The Right Hon. William Tatton, Baron Egerton, to be Her Majesty's Lieutenant for the county of Chester.

— 30. The honour of Knighthood conferred upon Charles Wheatstone, Esq., F.R.S.

Feb. 8. Sir Charles Jasper Selwyn, Knight, to be a Judge of the Court of Appeal in Chancery, in the room of the Right Hon. Sir John Rolt, Knight, resigned.

— 24. The Right Hon. Lord Augustus William Frederick Spencer Loftus, Her Majesty's Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the King of Prussia, to be Her Majesty's Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the North German Confederation.

— 25. James Haunen, Serjeant-at-Law, to be one of the Justices of Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench.

The dignity of a Baronet conferred on William Jenner, Esq., M.D., and the heirs male of his body lawfully begotten.

— 29. The honour of Knighthood conferred on William Baliol Brett, Esq., M.P., Her Majesty's Solicitor-General.

The Right Hon. Benjamin Dis-

raeli, the Right Hon. George Ward Hunt, the Hon. Gerard James Noel, Sir Graham Graham-Montgomery, and Henry Whitmore, Esq., to be Commissioners for executing the offices of Treasurer of the Exchequer of Great Britain, and Lord High Treasurer of Ireland.

March 5. Sir William Page Wood, Knight, a Vice-Chancellor, to be a Judge of the Court of Appeal in Chancery, in the room of the Right Honourable Hugh M'Calmont, Baron Cairns, resigned.

— 9. Francis Knollys, Esq., to be one of the Gentlemen Ushers Quarterly Waiters in Ordinary to Her Majesty, in the room of Captain Robert Tench Bedford, R.N., deceased.

Horace Rumbold, Esq., now Secretary of Her Majesty's Legation at Berne, to be Secretary of Her Majesty's Embassy at St. Petersburg; and Algernon Bertram Mitford, Esq., to be a Second Secretary in Her Majesty's Diplomatic Service; William Doria, Esq., now Secretary to Her Majesty's Legation at Stockholm, to be Secretary to Her Majesty's Legation at Lisbon; the Hon. Francis John Pakenham, now Secretary to Her Majesty's Legation at Rio de Janeiro, to be Secretary to Her Majesty's Legation at Stockholm; and Robert Thomas Charles Middleton, Esq., Secretary to Her Majesty's late Legation at Mexico, to be Secretary to Her Majesty's Legation at Berne.

— 11. George Markham Giffard, Esq., one of Her Majesty's Counsel, to be a Vice-Chancellor, in the room of Sir William Page Wood, resigned.

— 24. The Rev. John Edward Kempe, Rector of St. James's, Westminster, and Honorary Chaplain to Her Majesty, to be one of the Chaplains in Ordinary to Her Majesty; and the Hon. and Rev. George Thomas Orlando Bridgeman, Rector of Wigan, Lancashire, to be an Honorary Chaplain to Her Majesty.

March 31. Sir W. Page Wood, and Sir C. J. Selwyn, to be members of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

April 3. The Most Noble Richard Plantagenet Campbell Temple Nugent Brydges Chandos, Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, to be Her Majesty's Lieutenant for the county of Buckingham.

— 11. The dignity of a Baron of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland granted unto the following persons, and the respective heirs male of their bodies lawfully begotten:—

The Right Hon. Sir John Trollope, Bart., by the name, style, and title of Baron Kesteven, of Casewick, in the county of Lincoln.

Sir John Benn Walsh, Bart., by the name, style, and title of Baron Ormathwaite, of Ormathwaite, in the county of Cumberland.

Sir Brook William Bridges, Bart., by the name, style, and title of Baron Fitzwalter, of Woodham Walter, in the county of Essex.

William O'Neill, Clerk, by the name, style, and title of Baron O'Neill, of Shanes Castle, in the county of Antrim.

— 23. The Right Hon. John Baron Romilly; the Right Hon. Spencer Horatio Walpole; George Markham Giffard, Esq., a Vice-Chancellor; Edward Howes, Esq.; Arthur Hobhouse, Esq., one of Her Majesty's Counsel; Jacob Waley, Henry Thring, Edward Parker Wolstenholme, Esqrs., Barristers-at-Law; John Young and William James Farrer, Esqrs., to be Her Majesty's Commissioners to inquire into the operation of the Land Transfer Act, and also into the present condition of the Registry of Deeds for the County of Middlesex.

May 1. The Hon. and Ven. Charles Amyand Harris, M.A. (Archdeacon of Wilts), to be ordained and consecrated Bishop of the See of Gibraltar.

— 2. The Right Hon. George, Earl of Haddington, to be Her Majesty's High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

— 4. The Most Noble Arthur Richard, Duke of Wellington, K.G., to be Her Majesty's Lieutenant for the County of Middlesex.

Samuel Wensley Blackall, Esq. (late Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the West Africa Settlements), to be Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Colony of Queensland and its dependencies.

— 14. The honour of Knighthood conferred on George Markham Giffard, Esq., a Vice-Chancellor.

The Honour of Knighthood conferred on James Hannen, Esq., one of the Jus-

tices of Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench.

The honour of Knighthood conferred on the Right Hon. William Carroll, M.D., Lord Mayor of Dublin.

May 23. At the Court of Balmoral, Her Majesty, as Sovereign of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, was graciously pleased by letters patent under her Royal sign manual and the great seal of the Order, bearing date this day, to dispense with all the statutes and regulations usually observed in regard to installation, and to give and grant unto John Winston, Duke of Marlborough, Knight of the said most noble Order, and duly invested with the ensigns thereof, full power and authority to exercise all rights and privileges belonging to a Knight Companion of the said most noble Order of the Garter, in as full and ample a manner as if he had been formally installed, any decree, rule, or usage to the contrary notwithstanding.

June 16. The Hon. Lionel Sackville Sackville West, now Secretary to Her Majesty's Embassy at Berlin, to be Secretary to Her Majesty's Embassy at Paris.

— 22. Edward Dwyer, Esq., to be a Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of the colony of the Cape of Good Hope.

— 23. His Royal Highness Prince Arthur William Patrick Albert, K.G., from the Royal Military Academy, to be Lieutenant in the Royal Engineers.

— 26. Her Majesty issued a Commission under her royal sign manual to inquire into the present state of military education in this country. The Commissioners, Earl de Grey and Ripon, Lieutenant-Colonel Lord Eustace Cecil, Lieutenant-General Lord de Ros, Lord Northbrook, Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Charles Russell, Lieutenant-General Sir Duncan Alexander Cameron, the Rev. Henry Montagu Butler, D.D., the Rev. William Charles Lake, M.A., Brigadier-General John Henry Lefroy, Colonel Edmund Haythorne, and Lieutenant-Colonel Charles Cornwallis Chesney, required to report any recommendations they may have to make as to alterations in the system of military education, and in the constitution of the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich and of the Royal Military College at Sandhurst. Lieutenant John Wallace Hozier appointed Secretary.

July 7. The honour of Knighthood conferred on Thomas Tilson, Esq., of Clapham Park.

— 13. The Hon. Francis John Pakenham, now Secretary to Her Majesty's Legation at Stockholm, to be Secretary to Her Majesty's Legation at Brussels.

— 18. The Hon. William Nassau

Jocelyn, now a Second Secretary in Her Majesty's Diplomatic Service, to be Secretary to Her Majesty's Legation at Stockholm.

July 25. The dignities of Viscount and Earl of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland granted unto William Ernest, Baron Feversham, and to the heirs male of his body lawfully begotten, by the names, styles, and titles of Viscount Helmsley, of Helmsley, in the North Riding of the county of York, and Earl of Feversham, of Ryedale, in the North Riding of the county of York.

— 31. Joseph Stone Williams, to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Island of St. Helena.

Aug. 8. The dignity of a Baronet of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland granted unto George Etienne Cartier, of the city of Montreal, in the province of Quebec, in the Dominion of Canada, Esq., Minister of Militia in the Privy Council of the Dominion of Canada, and to the heirs male of his body lawfully begotten.

— 21. General his Royal Highness Albert Edward, Prince of Wales and Duke of Cornwall, K.G., K.T., G.C.B., K.P., G.C.S.I., to be Colonel-in-Chief of the Rifle Brigade, vice Field-Marshal the Right Hon. Sir Edward Blakeney, G.C.B., G.C.H., deceased.

— 24. Sir William Baliol Brett, Serjeant-at-Law, to be an additional Justice of Her Majesty's Court of Common Pleas.

Major-General Edward Lechmere Russell, Bombay Army, Political Resident at Aden, to be a Knight Commander of the Most Exalted Order of the Star of India; and Colonel William Lockyer Merewether, C.B., Bombay Staff Corps, Chief Commissioner in Sindh, and lately Political Resident at Aden, to be an Extra Knight Commander of the said Order.

Major James Augustus Grant, C.B., Bengal Staff Corps, to be a Companion of the said Most Exalted Order of the Star of India.

— 25. George Hayes, Serjeant-at-Law, to be an additional Justice of Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench.

Anthony Cleasby, Serjeant-at-Law, to be an additional Baron of Her Majesty's Court of Exchequer.

— 29. The dignity of a Knight of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland granted unto the following gentlemen:—Andrew Fairbairn, of Woodley-house, Leeds, in the West Riding of the County of York, Esq., Mayor of Leeds; Frederick Arrow, of Pilgrim's Hall, in the County of Essex, Esq., Deputy Master of the Trinity House, London; Edward

William Watkin, of Northenden, in the county Palatine of Chester, Esq.

Letters Patent under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland constituting and appointing the Right Hon. Henry Thomas Lowry Corry, Vice-Admiral Sir Alexander Milne, K.C.B.; Vice-Admiral Sir Sidney Colpoys Dacres, K.C.B.; Rear-Admiral George Henry Seymour, C.B.; Rear-Admiral Sir John Charles Dalrymple Hay; and the Hon. Frederick Arthur Stanley, to be Her Majesty's Commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral of the said United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the dominions, islands, and territories thereunto belonging.

Sept. 2. John Richard Quain, Esq., one of Her Majesty's Counsel, to be Her Majesty's Attorney-General of the county palatine of Durham, vacant by the death of Stephen Temple, Esq.

— 7. James Bacon, Esq., one of Her Majesty's Counsel learned in the law, to be one of the Commissioners of the Court of Bankruptcy, in the room of Edward Goulburn, Serjeant-at-Law, deceased.

— 9. The Rev. Hugh McNeile, D.D., the Deanery of Her Majesty's Cathedral Church of Ripon, void by the death of William Goode, D.D.

— 10. Sir Benjamin Chilley Campbell Pine, Knight, to be Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Colony of Western Australia and its dependencies.

— 16. Richard Baggallay, Esq., one of Her Majesty's Counsel learned in the law, to be Her Majesty's Solicitor-General.

Oct. 1. Major-General Philip Melmoth Nelson Guy, C.B., to be Lieutenant-Governor of the Island of Jersey, in the room of Lieutenant-General Burke Cuppage, whose period of service has expired.

— 9. Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Harry Creswicke Rawlinson, K.C.B., to be a member of the Council of India.

— 29. Harry Ernest Clay Ker Seymour, Esq., now a Second Secretary in Her Majesty's Diplomatic Service, and employed in Her Majesty's Embassy at Paris, to be Secretary to Her Majesty's Legation at Berne.

Nov. 9. The dignity of a Baronet of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland granted unto Charles Mills, of Hillingdon Court, and Camelford House, Park Lane, both in the County of Middlesex, Esq., late a Member of the Council of India, and the heirs male of his body lawfully begotten.

The dignity of a Baronet of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland granted unto Robert Bateson Harvey, of Langley Park, in the County of Bucking-

ham, Esq., and the heirs male of his body lawfully begotten.

Nov. 11. The Rev. William Weldon Champneys, Master of Arts, Canon of the Cathedral Church of St. Paul in London, to be Dean of the Cathedral Church of Lichfield, the same being void by the death of Dr. Henry Edward John Howard, late Dean thereof; the Queen has been pleased to grant unto Francis Kynvett Leighton, Doctor in Divinity, the place and dignity of a Canon of the Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, the same being void by the death of the Rev. Ernest Hawkins, late Canon thereof.

— 18. The Right Hon. Sir^o John Young, Bart., K.C.B., G.C.M.G., late Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief in and over the Colony of New South Wales, to be an extra member of the civil division of the first class, or Knights Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath.

The dignity of a Baronet of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland granted to the undermentioned gentlemen and the respective heirs male of their bodies lawfully begotten:—

Francis Arthur Knox-Gore, of Belleek Manor, in the county of Mayo, Esq., Her Majesty's Lieutenant of the County of Sligo.

Smith Child, of Newfield and of Stalling-ton, in the County of Stafford, and of Dunlosset, Islay, in the County of Argyll, Esq.

Robert John Harvey Harvey, of Crown Point, in the parish of Trowse, in the County of Norfolk, Esq.

James Walker, of Sand Hutton, in the North Riding of the County of York, and of Beachampton, in the County of Buckingham, Esq.

— 26. The Queen has been pleased to order a *congé d'élire* to pass the Great Seal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland empowering the Dean and Chapter of the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury to elect an Archbishop of that see, the same being void by the death of Dr. Charles Thomas Longley, late Archbishop thereof; and Her Majesty has also been pleased to recommend to the said Dean and Chapter the Right Hon. and Right Rev. Father in God, Dr. Archibald Campbell Tait, now Bishop of London, to be by them elected Archbishop of the said see of Canterbury.

— 28. Letters Patent to be passed under the Great Seal granting the dignity of a Viscountess of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, unto Mary Anne, wife of the Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli, of Hughenden Manor, in the County of Buckingham, by the name,

style, and title of Viscountess Beaconsfield, of Beaconsfield, in the County of Buckingham, and at her decease the dignity of a Viscount of the said United Kingdom to the heirs male of her body lawfully begotten.

Dec. 1. The dignity of a Baron of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland granted unto Edward Anthony John, Viscount Gormanston, in that part of the said United Kingdom called Ireland, and the heirs male of his body lawfully begotten, by the name, style, and title of Baron Gormanston, of Whitewood, in the County of Meath.

The Rev. Robert Gregory to be a Canon of the Cathedral Church of St. Paul in London, void by the promotion of the Rev. William Weldon Champneys to the Deanery of the Cathedral Church of Lichfield.

The Rev. William Bright, M.A., to be Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, in the room of the Rev. Henry Longueville Mansel, promoted to the Deanery of St. Paul's in London.

— 2. Henry Lowther, Esq., to be Lord-Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the counties of Westmorland and Cumberland, in the room of the Right Hon. the Earl of Lonsdale, resigned.

— 4. The names of the Peers elected and chosen to sit and vote in the House of Peers in the ensuing Parliament of the United Kingdom:—The Marquis of Tweeddale, the Earl of Morton, the Earl of Home, the Earl of Haddington, the Earl of Lauderdale, the Earl of Airlie, the Earl of Leven and Melville, the Earl of Selkirk, the Earl of Orkney, Viscount Strathallan, the Lord Saltoun, the Lord Sinclair, the Lord Elphinstone, the Lord Blantyre, the Lord Colville of Culross.

— 9. John Bright, Esq., Hugh Culling Eardley Childers, Esq., Austen Henry Layard, Esq., and William Edward Forster, Esq., sworn of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

Her Majesty in Council delivered the Great Seal to the Right Hon. Sir William Page Wood, Knight, whereupon the oath of Lord Chancellor of Great Britain was by Her Majesty's command administered to him, and he took his place at the Board accordingly.

The dignity of a Baron of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland granted unto the Right Hon. Sir William Page Wood, Knight, Chancellor, of that part of the said United Kingdom called Great Britain, and to the heirs male of his body lawfully begotten, by the name, style, and title of Baron Hatherley, of Down Hatherley, in the County of Gloucester.

The honour of Knighthood conferred on Anthony Cleasby, one of the Barons of Her Majesty's Court of Exchequer, Richard Buggallay, Esq., Her Majesty's Solicitor-General, Louis Mallett, Esq., C.B., Assistant-Secretary to the Board of Trade, and George Hayes, Esq., one of the Justices of Her Majesty's Court of Queen's Bench.

Dec. 15. The Right Hon. George Joachim Goschen, to be Poor Law Commissioner for England.

— 16. The Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone; the Right Hon. Robert Lowe; James Stansfeld, jun., Esq.; the

Most Hon. Henry Charles Keith, Marquis of Lansdowne; William Patrick Adam, Esq.; and the Hon. John Cranch Walker Vivian, to be Commissioners for executing the offices of Treasurer of the Exchequer of Great Britain and Lord High Treasurer of Ireland.

Sir William Snagg, Knt., to be Chief Justice for the Colony of British Guiana. Sydney Smith Bell, Esq., to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope; and Charles Thomas Smith, Esq., to be Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of that colony.

HER MAJESTY'S MINISTERS AND CHIEF OFFICERS OF STATE.

THE CABINET.

First Lord of the Treasury, Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone.

Lord High Chancellor, Right Hon. Lord Hatherley.

Lord President of the Council, Right Hon. Earl de Grey and Ripon.

Lord Privy Seal, Right Hon. Earl of Kimberley.

Secretary of State, Home Department, Right Hon. Henry Austin Bruce.

Secretary of State, Foreign Department, Right Hon. Earl of Clarendon.

Secretary of State, Colonial Department, Right Hon. Earl Granville.

Secretary of State, War Department, Right Hon. Edward Cardwell.

Secretary of State, Indian Department, His Grace Duke of Argyll.

Chancellor of the Exchequer, Right Hon. Robert Lowe.

First Lord of the Admiralty, Right Hon. H. C. E. Childers.

President of the Board of Trade, Right Hon. John Bright.

Chief Secretary for Ireland, Right Hon. Chichester Fortescue.

Postmaster-General, Right Hon. Marquis of Hartington.

President of Poor Law Board, Right Hon. G. Joachim Goschen.

Commander-in-Chief, Field-Marshal His Royal Highness Duke of Cambridge.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Right Hon. Lord Dufferin and Clarendon.

Works and Public Buildings, Austen Henry Layard, Esq.

Vice-President of Committee of Council of Education, William E. Forster, Esq.

Third Lord of the Treasury, James Stansfeld, Esq.

Junior Lords of Her Majesty's Treasury, W. P. Adam, Esq., Cupt. Hon. J. Vivian, Marquis of Lansdowne.

Joint Secretaries to the Treasury, George Glyn, Esq., A. S. Ayrton, Esq.

Judge Advocate-General and Judge Marshal, Right Hon. Sir Colman O'Loughlen.

Junior Lords of the Admiralty, Vice-Admiral Sir S. C. Dacres, Vice-Admiral Sir R. S. Robinson, Lord John Hay, George O. Trevelyan, Esq.

Under Secretary of State, Home Department, E. H. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Esq.

Under Secretary of State, Foreign Department, A. J. Otway, Esq.

Under Secretary of State, Colonial Department, Right Hon. William Monsell.

Under Secretary of State, War Department, Lord Northbrook.

Under Secretary of State, Indian Department, M. E. Grant Duff, Esq.

Attorney-General, Sir Robert Porrett Collier.

Solicitor-General, Sir John Duke Coleridge.

Viceroy of India, the Earl of Mayo.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Earl Spencer, K.G.

Master of the Mint, T. Graham, Esq.

Earl Marshal, Duke of Norfolk.

Lord Great Chamberlain, Lord Willoughby d'Eresby.

Lord Chamberlain of the Household, Viscount Sydney.

Lord Steward of the Household, Earl of Bessborough.

Master of the Horse, Marquis of Ailesbury.

Master of the Buckhounds, Earl of Cork.

THE NEW HOUSE OF COMMONS,

ELECTED NOVEMBER, 1868.

* *New Members.* † *New Constituencies.* *L. Liberal.* *C. Conservative.*

ENGLAND AND WALES.

Abingdon—Hon. C. H. Lindsay, C.
Andover—Hon. D. F. Fortescue, L.
ANGLESEA—*R. Davies, L.
Ashton-under-Lyne—*T. Mellor, C.
Aylesbury—N. M. de Rothschild, L.
 S. G. Smith, C.
Banbury—B. Samuelson, L.
Barnstaple—T. Cave, L.
 *Captain Williams, C.
Bath—W. Tite, L.
 *D. Dalrymple, L.
Beaumaris—Hon. W. O. Stanley, L.
Bedford—*J. Howard, L.
 S. Whitbread, L.
BEDS—Colonel Gilpin, C.
 F. C. H. Russell, L.
BERKS—R. Benyon, C.
 R. J. Lloyd-Lindsay, C.
 *John Walter, L.
Berwick—*Lord Bury, L.
 *J. Stapleton, L.
Beverley—Sir H. Edwards, C.
 *Captain Kennard, C.
Bewdley—*Sir R. A. Glass, C.
Birkenhead—John Laird, C.
Birmingham—G. Dixon, L.
 *P. H. Muntz, L.
 J. Bright, L.
Blackburn—W. H. Hornby, C.
 *Joseph Feilden, C.
Bodmin—Hon. E. L. Gower, L.
Bolton—*J. Hick, C.
 W. Gray, C.
Boston—J. W. Malcolm, C.
 *T. Collins, C.
Bradford—W. E. Forster, L.
 *H. W. Ripley, L.
Brecknock—H. Gwyn, C.
BRECKNOCK—Hon. Major Morgan, C.
Bridgnorth—H. Whitmore, C.
Bridgewater—A. W. Kinglake, L.
 P. Vanderbyl, L.
Bridport—T. A. Mitchell, L.
Brighton—J. White, L.
 H. Fawcett, L.
Bristol—Hon. F. H. F. Berkeley, L.
 *S. Morley, L.
Buckingham—Sir H. Verney, L.
BUCKS—Right Hon. B. Disraeli, C.
 C. G. Du Pre, C.
 *N. G. Lambert, L.
†*Burnley*—*R. Shaw, L.
Bury St. Edmund's—E. Greene, C.
 J. A. Hardcastle, L.

Bury (Lanc.)—R. N. Philips, L.
Calne—*Lord E. Fitzmaurice, L.
Cambridge—*Colonel Torrens, L.
 *W. Fowler, L.
Cambridge Univ.—Rt. Hon. S. Walpole, C.
 A. J. B. Hope, C.
CAMBRIDGE—Lord G. Manners, C.
 Lord Royston, C.
 Right Hon. H. Brand, L.
Canterbury—A. Butler-Johnstone, C.
 *T. H. Brinckman, L.
†*Cardiff*—Colonel Stuart, L.
CARDIGAN—*E. M. Richards, L.
Cardigan—Sir T. D. Lloyd, L.
Carlisle—*Sir W. Lawson, L.
 E. Potter, L.
Carmarthen—*Colonel C. Stepney, L.
CARMARTHEN—J. Jones, C.
 *E. J. Sartoris, L.
Carnarvon—W. B. Hughes, L.
CARNARVON—*Capt. Parry, L.
Chatham—A. J. Otway, L.
†*Chelsea*—*C. W. Dilke, L.
 Sir H. A. Hoare, L.
Cheltenham—*H. B. Samuelson, L.
CHESHIRE (East)—W. J. Legh, C.
 *E. C. Egerton, C.
†*CHESHIRE (Mid)*—*Hon. W. Egerton, C.
 *G. C. Legh, C.
CHESHIRE (West)—Sir P. Egerton, C.
 J. Tollemache, C.
Chester—Earl Grosvenor, L.
 *H. C. Raikes, C.
Chichester—Lord H. Lennox, C.
Chippenham—G. Goldney, C.
Christchurch—*E. Haviland-Burke, L.
Cirencester—Hon. A. Bathurst, C.
Clitheroe—*R. Ashton, C.
Cockermouth—*I. Fletcher, L.
Colchester—J. G. Rebow, L.
 *W. Brewer, L.
CORNWALL (E.)—*Sir John S. Trelawny, L.
 E. B. Williams, L.
CORNWALL (West)—J. St. Aubyn, L.
 *A. P. Vivian, L.
Coventry—H. W. Eaton, C.
 *A. S. Hill, C.
Cricklade—*Hon. F. Cadogan, L.
 Sir D. Gooch, C.
CUMBERLAND (East)—Hon. C. W. G.
 Howard, L.
 W. N. Hodgson.
CUMBERLAND (West)—Col. Lowther, C.
 Hon. P. Wyndham, C.

- †*Darlington*—*E. Backhouse, L.
Denbigh—*W. Williams, L.
 DENBIGH—Sir W. Wynne, C.
 *G. O. Morgan, L.
Derby—M. T. Bass, L.
 *S. Plimsoll, L.
 †DERBY (East)—*Hon. Capt. Egerton, L.
 *Hon. H. Strutt, L.
 DERBY (South)—*Sir T. Gresley, C.
 *Rowland Smith, C.
 DERBY (North)—Lord G. Cavendish, L.
 *A. P. Arkwright, C.
Devizes—Sir T. Bateson, C.
 DEVON (North)—Sir S. H. Northcote, C.
 T. Dyke Acland, L.
 †DEVON (East)—Sir L. Palk, C.
 Lord Courtenay, C.
 DEVON (South)—Sir L. M. Lopes, C.
 S. T. Kekewich, C.
Devonport—M. Chambers, L.
 *J. D. Lewis, L.
 †*Dewsbury*—*J. Simon, L.
Dorchester—Colonel Sturt, C.
 DORSET—W. H. B. Portman, L.
 H. G. Sturt, C.
 J. Floyer, C.
Dover—Major Dickson, C.
 *G. Jessel, L.
Droitwich—Sir J. Pakington, C.
Dudley—H. B. Sheridan, L.
Durham—J. Henderson, L.
 *J. R. Davidson, L.
 DURHAM (North)—Sir H. Williamson, L.
 *G. Elliot, C.
 DURHAM (South)—J. W. Pease, L.
 *Capt. F. E. B. Beaumont, L.
 ESSEX (East)—*J. Round, C.
 *Lt.-Col. Ruggles Brise, C.
 †ESSEX (West)—*Lord E. Cecil, C.
 *H. J. Selwin-Ibbetson, C.
 ESSEX (South)—*R. W. Baker, L.
 *A. Johnston, L.
Evesham—Colonel Bourne, C.
Exeter—J. D. Coleridge, L.
 *E. A. Bowring, L.
Eye—Viscount Barrington, C.
Finsbury—W. McCullagh Torrens, L.
 A. Lusk, L.
Flint—Sir J. Hanmer, L.
 FLINT—Lord R. Grosvenor, L.
Frome—T. Hughes, L.
Gateshead—Right Hon. Sir W. Hutt, L.
 GLAMORGAN—C. R. M. Talbot, L.
 H. H. Vivian, L.
Gloucester—W. P. Price, L.
 C. J. Monk, L.
 GLOUCESTER (East)—K. S. Holford, C.
 Sir M. Beach, C.
 GLOUCESTER (W.)—R. N. F. Kingscote, L.
 *S. S. Marling, C.
Grantham—*Hon. F. J. Tollemache, L.
 *Capt. Cholmeley, L.
 †*Gravesend*—*Sir C. Wingfield, L.
Greenwich—Alderman Salomons, L.
 Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, L.
- Grimsby*—*G. Tomline, L.
Guildford—G. J. H. Onslow, L.
 †*Huckney*—*C. Reed, L.
 *J. Holms, L.
Halifax—J. Stansfeld, L.
 E. Akroyd, L.
 HANTS (S.)—Right Hon. W. F. Cowper, L.
 Lord H. Scott, C.
 HANTS (N.)—W. W. B. Beach, C.
 G. Selater-Booth, C.
 †*Hartlepool*—*R. W. Jackson, C.
Harwich—Colonel Jervis, C.
Hastings—*T. Brassey, L.
 *F. North, L.
Haverfordwest—*Colonel Edwards, L.
Helston—*A. W. Young, L.
Hereford—G. Clive, L.
 *J. W. S. Wyllie, L.
 HEREFORD—Sir J. R. Bailey, C.
 *Sir H. D. Croft, C.
 R. M. Biddulph, L.
Hertford—R. Dimsdale, C.
 HERTS—Abel Smith, C.
 Hon. H. F. Cowper, L.
 *H. R. Brand, L.
Horsham—*Major Aldridge, C.
 R. H. Hurst, L.
 (Double return.)
Huddersfield—*E. A. Leatham, L.
Hull—C. M. Norwood, L.
 J. Clay, L.
Huntingdon—T. Baring, C.
 HUNTS—E. Fellowes, C.
 Lord R. Montagu, C.
Hythe—Baron M. Rothschild, L.
Ipswich—H. E. Adair, L.
 *H. W. West, L.
Kendal—*J. Whitwell, L.
 KENT (East)—E. L. Pemberton, C.
 *Hon. G. W. Milles, C.
 †KENT (Mid)—*Lord Holmesdale, C.
 *W. Hart Dyke, C.
 KENT (West)—*C. H. Mills, C.
 *J. G. Talbot, C.
Kidderminster—*T. Lea, L.
King's Lynn—Right Hon. Lord Stanley, C.
 *Hon. R. Bourke, C.
Knaresboro'—*A. Illingworth, L.
Lambeth—*Alderman J. C. Lawrence, L.
 *W. M'Arthur, L.
 LANCASHIRE (N.)—Right Hon. J. Wilson Patten, C.
 *Capt. Stanley, C.
 †LANCASHIRE (N.E.)—*J. M. Holt, C.
 *J. P. Starkie, C.
 †LANCASHIRE (S.W.)—C. Turner, C.
 R. A. Cross, C.
 †LANCASHIRE (S.E.)—Hon. A. F. Egerton, C.
 *J. S. Henry, C.
Launceston—*H. C. Lopes, C.
Leeds—E. Baines, L.
 *Alderman Carter, L.
 *W. St. J. Wheelhouse, C.

- Leicester*—P. A. Taylor, L.
J. D. Harris, L.
LEICESTER (North)—Right Hon. Lord
J. R. Manners, C.
*S. W. Clowes, C.
LEICESTER (South)—Lord Curzon, C.
*A. Pell, C.
Leominster—R. Arkwright, C. *
Lewes—Lord Pelham, L.
Lichfield—Colonel R. Dyott, C.
Lincoln—C. Seely, L.
*J. H. Palmer, L.
†*LINCOLN (Mid)*—*H. Chaplin, C.
*Colonel Amcotts, L.
LINCOLN (N.)—Sir M. J. Chohneley, L.
*R. Winn, C.
LINCOLN (South)—W. E. Welby, C.
E. Turnor, C.
Liskeard—Sir A. W. Buller, L.
Liverpool—S. R. Graves, C.
*Lord Sandon, C.
*W. Rathbone, L.
London—Right Hon. G. J. Goschen, L.
Alderman W. Lawrence, L.
R. W. Crawford, L.
*C. Bell, C.
**London Univ.*—Right Hon. R. Lowe, L.
Ludlow—Hon. Col. Clive, C.
Lymington—Lord G. Lennox, C.
Macclesfield—*W. C. Brocklehurst, L.
*D. Chadwick, L.
Maidstone—W. Lee, L.
J. Whatman, L.
Maldon—*E. H. Bentall, L.
Malton—Hon. C. W. Fitzwilliam, L.
Malmesbury—*W. Powell, C.
Manchester—*H. Birley, C.
T. Bazley, L.
Jacob Bright, L.
Marlborough—Lord E. Bruce, L.
Marlow—*T. O. Wethered, C.
Marylebone—H. Lewis, L.
T. Chambers, L.
MERIONETH—*D. Williams, L.
Merthyr Tydvil—*H. Richard, L.
R. Fothergill, L.
MIDDLESEX—*Lord George Hamilton, C.
Viscount Enfield, L.
†*Middlesborough*—*H. W. F. Bolckow, L.
Midhurst—W. T. Mitford, C.
Monmouth—*Sir J. Ramsden, L.
MONMOUTH—C. O. S. Morgan, C.
Colonel Somerset, C.
Montgomery—Hon. C. Hanbury-Tracy, L.
MONTGOMERY—C. W. W. Wynn, C.
Morpeth—Right Hon. Sir G. Grey, L.
Newark—G. Hodgkinson, L.
*E. Denison, L.
Newcastle-on-Tyne—J. Cowen, L.
T. E. Headlam, L.
Newcastle-under-Lyme—E. Buckley, C.
W. S. Allen, L.
Newport (I.W.)—C. Wykeham Martin, L.
†*NORFOLK (N.E.)*—*Hon. F. Walpole, C.
Sir E. Lacon, C.
†*NORFOLK (S.E.)*—C. S. Read, C.
E. Howes, C.
NORFOLK (W.)—Sir W. Bagge, C.
Hon. T. De Grey, C.
Northallerton—*J. Hutton, L.
Northampton—Lord Henley, L.
C. Gilpin, L.
NORTHAMPTON (North)—Right Hon. G.
Ward Hunt, C.
S. G. Stopford, C.
NORTHAMPTON (S.)—Sir R. Knightley, C.
*Major F. W. Cartwright, C.
NORTHUMBERLAND (South)—W. B. Beaumont, L.
Hon. H. G. Liddell, C.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.)—Earl Percy, C.
*M. W. Ridley, C.
Norwich—Sir W. Russell, L.
Sir H. J. Stracey, C.
Nottingham—*Sir R. Clifton, C.
*Colonel Wright, C.
NOTTS (N.)—Right Hon. J. E. Denison, L.
F. C. Smith, C.
NOTTS (South)—W. H. Barrow, C.
T. B. Hildyard, C.
Oldham—J. T. Hibbert, L.
J. Platt, L.
Oxford Univ.—Right Hon. G. Hardy, C.
Right Hon. J. R. Mowbray, C.
Oxford—Right Hon. E. Cardwell, L.
*W. G. Vernon Harcourt, L.
OXFORD—Right Hon. J. W. Henley, C.
Colonel J. S. North, C.
*W. C. Cartwright, L.
Pembroke—*T. C. Meyrick, C.
PEMBROKE—J. H. Scourfield, C.
Penrhy & Falmouth—*R. N. Fowler, C.
*E. B. Eastwick, C.
Peterborough—G. H. Whalley, L.
W. Wells, L.
Petersfield—W. Nicholson, L.
Plymouth—Sir R. P. Collier, L.
W. Morrison, L.
Pontefract—H. C. E. Childers, L.
Major Waterhouse, C.
Poole—*A. Guest, C.
Portsmouth—*Sir J. Elphinstone, C.
W. H. Stone, L.
Preston—*E. Hermon, C.
Sir T. G. Heskeith, C.
Radnor—R. G. Price, L.
RADNOR—Hon. A. Walsh, C.
Reading—Sir F. H. Goldsmid, L.
G. J. Shaw Lefevre, L.
Retford (East)—F. J. S. Foljambe, C.
Viscount Galway, C.
Richmond—Sir R. Palmer, L.
Ripon—Lord J. Hay, L.
Rochdale—T. B. Potter, L.
Rochester—P. W. Martin, L.
Serjeant Kinglake, L. *
RUTLAND—Hon. G. J. Noel, C.
*G. H. Finch, C.
Rye—*J. S. Hardy, C.

- Salford*—*C. E. Cawley, C.
*W. T. Charley, C.
- Salisbury*—*J. A. Lush, L.
*E. W. T. Hamilton, L.
- SALOP (North)*—J. R. Ormsby Gore, C.
Viscount Newport, C.
- SALOP (South)*—Gen. P. E. Herbert, C.
*Col. E. Corbett, C.
- Sandwich*—E. Knatchbull-Hugessen, L.
*H. A. Brassey, L.
- Scarborough*—Sir J. Johnstone, L.
J. D. Dent, L.
- Shaftesbury*—G. G. Glyn, L.
- Sheffield*—G. Hadfield, L.
*A. J. Mundella, L.
- Shoreham*—Right Hon. S. Cave, C.
Sir P. Burrell, C.
- Shrewsbury*—W. J. Clement, L.
*J. Figgins, C.
- SOMERSET (East)*—*R. Bright, C.
Major R. S. Allen, C.
- SOMERSET (W.)*—Hon. Capt. A. Hood, C.
W. Gore Langton, C.
- †*SOMERSET (Mid)*—R. N. Grenville, C.
R. H. Puget, C.
- Southampton*—R. Gurney, C.
*P. M. Hoare, C.
- Southwark*—J. Locke, L.
A. H. Layard, L.
- South Shields*—*J. C. Stephenson, L.
- Stafford*—Col. Meller, C.
*H. D. Pochin, L.
- †*STAFFORD (W.)*—*Sir H. M. Ingram, C.
*Sir Smith Child, C.
- †*STAFFORD (East)*—*J. R. M'Leau, L.
M. A. Bass, L.
- STAFFORD (North)*—*Right Hon. C. B. Adderley, C.
Sir E. M. Buller, L.
- †*Stalybridge*—*J. Sidebottom, C.
- Stamford*—Rear-Admiral Sir J. Hay, C.
- St. Ives*—*C. Magniac, L.
- Stockport*—*W. Tipping, C.
J. B. Smith, L.
- †*Stockton*—*J. Dodds, L.
- Stoke-on-Trent*—*G. Melly, L.
W. S. Roden, L.
- Stroud*—*S. S. Dickinson, L.
H. S. P. Winterbotham, L.
- SUFFOLK (E)*—Hon. J. Henniker-Major, C.
F. Corrance, C.
- SUFFOLK (West)*—Major Parker, C.
Lord A. Hervey, C.
- Sunderland*—J. Candlish, L.
*E. T. Gourley, L.
- SURREY (E.)*—Hon. P. J. Locke King, L.
C. Buxton, L.
- †*SURREY (Mid)*—*Hon. W. Brodrick, C.
*H. W. Peek, C.
- SURREY (West)*—G. Cubitt, C.
J. I. Briscoe, L.
- SUSSEX (East)*—J. G. Dodson, L.
*G. B. Gregory, C.
- SUSSEX (West)*—Colonel Barttelot, C.
Hon. H. Wyndham, C.
- Swansea*—L. L. Dillwyn, L.
- Tamworth*—Sir R. Peel, L.
*Sir H. L. Bulwer, L.
- Taunton*—A. C. Barclay, L.
*E. W. Cox, C.
- Tavistock*—A. Russell, L.
- Twickenham*—*W. E. Price, L.
- Thirsk*—Sir W. P. Gallwey, C.
- Tiverton*—Hon. G. Denman, L.
J. H. Amory, L.
- Tower Hamlets*—A. S. Ayrton, L.
J. D'A. Samuda, L.
- Truro*—F. M. Williams, C.
Hon. Capt. Vivian, L.
- Tynemouth*—*T. E. Smith, L.
- Wakefield*—*S. A. Beaumont, L.
- Wallingford*—*S. Vickers, C.
- Walsall*—C. Forster, L.
- Wareham*—Vacant.
- Warrington*—*P. Rylands, L.
- Warwick*—A. W. Peel, L.
*E. Greaves, C.
- WARWICK (North)*—C. N. Newdegate, C.
W. B. Davenport, C.
- WARWICK (South)*—H. C. Wise, C.
J. Hardy, C.
- †*Wednesbury*—*A. Brogden, L.
- Wenlock*—Right Hon. G. Forester, C.
*A. H. Brown, L.
- Westbury*—*J. L. Phipps, C.
- Westminster*—*W. H. Smith, C.
Hon. R. W. Grosvenor, L.
- WESTMORELAND*—Earl Bective, C.
W. Lowther, C.
- Weymouth*—*C. J. T. Hambro, C.
H. Edwards, L.
- Whitby*—*W. H. Gladstone, L.
- Whitehaven*—*G. Bentinck, C.
- Wigan*—H. Woods, L.
*J. Lancaster, L.
- Wight (Isle of)*—Sir J. Simeon, L.
- Willon*—E. Antrobus, L.
- WILTS (North)*—Lord C. Bruce, L.
*Sir G. S. Jenkinson, C.
- WILTS (South)*—Lord H. Thynne, C.
T. F. Grove, L.
- Winchester*—W. B. Simonds, C.
J. Bonham Carter, L.
- Windsor*—R. Eykyn, L.
- Wolverhampton*—Right Hon. C. P. Villiers, L.
T. M. Weguelin, L.
- Woodstock*—H. Barnett, C.
- Worcester*—*W. Laslett, C.
A. C. Sherriff, L.
- WORCESTER (E.)*—*Hon. C. Lyttelton, L.
*R. P. Amphlett, C.
- WORCESTER (W.)*—W. E. Dowdeswell, C.
F. W. Knight, C.
- Wycombe*—*Hon. Capt. Carington, L.
- Fork*—J. Lowther, C.
*J. P. B. Westhead, L.
- YORKS (W.R., N.Div.)*—Sir F. Crossley, L.
Lord F. Cavendish, L.

YORKS (W. R., S.)—Viscount Milton, L.
H. F. Beaumont, L.
YORKS (W. R., E.)—*C. B. Denison, C.
*Joshua Feilden, C.

YORKS (N. R.)—Hon. W. E. Duncombe, C.
F. A. Milbank, L.
YORKS (E. R.)—*C. Sykes, C.
*W. H. Broadley, C.

SCOTLAND.

Aberdeen—Colonel Sykes, L.
ABERDEEN (East)—W. D. Fordyce, L.
*ABERDEEN (West)—W. M'Crombie, L.
ARGYLE—Marquis of Lorne, L.
Ayr—E. H. Craufurd, L.
AYR (North)—*W. Finnie, L.
†AYR (South)—*Sir D. Wedderburn, L.
BANFF—R. Duff, L.
BERWICK—D. Robertson, L.
BUTE—*C. Dalrymple, C.
CAITHNESS—G. Traill, L.
CLACKMANNAN and KINROSS—W. P.
Adam, L.
DUMBARTON—*A. Orr-Ewing, C.
Dumfries—*R. Jardine, L.
DUMFRIES—*Sir S. Waterlow, L.
Dundee—*G. Armitstead, L.
Sir J. Ogilvy, L.
Edinburgh—D. McLaren, L.
*J. Miller, L.
Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities
—*L. Playfair, C.B., L.
EDINBURGH—*Sir A. Maitland, L.
Elgin—M. E. Grant Duff, L.
ELGIN & NAIRN—*Hon. J. O. Grant, C.
Falkirk—J. Merry, L.
FIFE—Sir R. Anstruther, L.
FORFAR—Hon. C. Carnegie, L.
Glasgow—W. Graham, L.
R. Dalglish, L.
*G. Anderson, L.
†*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities.*—
*Jas. Moncreiff, L.

Greenock—*J. J. Grieve, L.
Haddington—Sir H. Davie, L.
HADDINGTON—Lord Elcho, C.
†*Hawick*—G. O. Trevelyan, L.
Inverness—*E. W. Macintosh, L.
INVERNESS—*D. Cameron, C.
Kilmarnock—Right Hon. E. P. Bon-
verie, L.
KINCARDINE—J. D. Nichol, L.
Kirkcaldy—R. S. Aytoun, L.
KIRKCUDBRIGHT—*W. H. Maxwell, C.
LANARK (North)—Sir T. Colebrooke, L.
†LANARK (South)—*Major Hamilton.
Leith—*R. A. Macfie, L.
LINLITHGOW—P. M'Lagan, C.
Montrose—W. E. Baxter, L.
ORKNEY and SHETLAND—F. Dundas, L.
Paisley—H. E. Crum-Ewing, L.
PEEBLES and SELKIRK—*Sir G. G.
Montgomery, C.
Perth—Hon. A. Kinnaird, L.
PERTH—*C. S. Parker, L.
RENFREW—A. A. Spiers, L.
ROSS and CROMARTY—*A. Matheson, L.
ROXBURGH—Sir W. Scott, L.
St. Andrew's—E. Ellice, L.
Stirling—*H. Campbell, L.
STIRLING—Admiral Erskine, L.
SUTHERLAND—Lord R. L. Gower, L.
Wick—*G. Loch, L.
Wigton—G. Young, L.
WIGTON—*Lord Gurlies, C.

IRELAND.

ANTRIM—Hon. E. O'Neill, C.
Admiral Seymour, C.
Armagh—J. Vance, C.
ARMAGH—Sir J. M. Stronge, C.
*W. Verner, C.
Athlone—*J. Ennis, L.
Bandon—*W. Shaw, L.
Belfast—*W. Johnston, C.
*T. McClure, L.
Carlow—*Captain Fagan, L.
CARLOW—H. Bruen, C.
*A. Kavanagh, C.
Carrickfergus—*M. R. Dalway, C.
Cashel—J. L. O'Beirne, L.
CATAN—Hon. Col. Annesley, C.
E. J. Sanderson, L.
CLARE—Colonel Vandeleur, C.
Sir C. O'Loghlen, L.

Clonmel—J. Bagwell, L.
Coleraine—Sir H. H. Bruce, C.
CORK—*Mc C. Downing, L.
*A. H. S. Barry, L.
Cork—J. F. Maguire, L.
N. D. Murphy, L.
DONGAL—Viscount Hamilton, C.
T. Conolly, C.
DOWN—Colonel W. B. Forde, C.
Lord A. Hill Trevor, C.
Downpatrick—W. Keown, C.
Drogheda—B. Whitworth, L.
Dublin—Sir A. Guinness, C.
J. Finn, L.
DUBLIN—Colonel Taylor, C.
I. T. Hamilton, C.
Dublin University—A. Lefroy, C.
*Dr. J. T. Ball, C.

- Dundalk*—*P. Callan, L.
Dungannon—Hon. C. S. Knox, C.
Dungarvan—*H. Matthews, C.
Ennis—Captain Staacpooles, L.
Eniskillen—*Viscount Crichton, C.
FERMANAGH—Hon. Colonel Cole, C.
 Captain Archdall, C.
Galway—Sir R. Blennherhasset, L.
 *Lord St. Lawrence, L.
GALWAY—W. H. Gregory, L.
 Viscount Burke, L.
KERRY—Lord Castlerosse, L.
 H. A. Herbert, L.
KILDARE—Right Hon. W. Cogan, L.
 Lord O. Fitzgerald, L.
Kilkenny—Sir J. Gray, L.
KILKENNY—G. L. Bryan, L.
 L. Agar Ellis, L.
KING'S COUNTY—Sir P. O'Brien, L.
 *D. Sherlock, L.
Kinsale—Sir G. Colthurst, L.
LEITRIM—Dr. J. Brady, L.
 W. Ormsby Gore, C.
Limerick—Major Gavin, L.
 F. W. Russell, L.
LIMERICK—Right Hon. W. Monsell, L.
 E. J. Synan, L.
Lisburn—E. W. Verner, C.
Londonderry—*R. Dowse, L.
LONDONDERY—R. Peel Dawson, C.
 Sir F. W. Heygate, C.
LONGFORD—Col. S. Greville Nugent, L.
 Major O'Reilly, L.
LOUTH—Right Hon. C. Fortescue, L.
 *M. O'Reilly Dease, L.
- Mallow*—E. Sullivan, L.
MAYO—Lord Bingham, C.
 *G. H. Moore, L.
MEATH—M. E. Corbally, L.
 E. F. M'Evoy, L.
MONAGHAN—Colonel O'C. P. Leslie, C.
 *S. E. Shirley, C.
New Ross—*P. M'Mahon, L.
Newry—*W. Kirk, L.
Portarlington—*Capt. Damer, C.
QUEEN'S Co.—Right Hon. J. W. Fitzpatrick, L.
 *K. T. Digby, L.
ROSCOMMON—C. O. O'Connor, L.
 Right Hon. Col. French, L.
SLIGO—*D. M. O'Connor, L.
 Sir R. G. Booth, C.
Sligo—*Major L. Knox, C.
TIPPERARY—C Moore, L.
 Hon. Captain White, L.
Tralee—D. O'Donoghue, L.
TYRONE—Lord C. Hamilton, C.
 Right Hon. H. T. L. Corry, C.
Waterford—J. A. Blake, L.
 *J. Delahunty, L.
WATERFORD—J. Esmonde, L.
 E. De la Poer, L.
WESTMEATH—W. Pollard-Urquhart, L.
 W. F. Greville-Nugent, L.
Wexford—R. J. Devereux, L.
WEXFORD—*J. T. Power, L.
 *M. P. Darcey, L.
WICKLOW—W. Fitzwilliam Dick, C.
 *H. W. Fitzwilliam, L.
Foughal—C. Weguelin, L.

HIGH SHERIFFS FOR 1868.

ENGLAND.

- BEDFORDSHIRE*—Sir J. M. Burgoyne, Bart.
BERKSHIRE—Alexander William Cobham, of Leighton Park, Reading, Esq.
BUCKS—James Carson, of Spinfield, Great Marlow, Esq.
CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND HUNTINGDONSHIRE—George Ebenezer Foster, of Brooklands, Cambridge, Esq.
CHESHIRE—John Coutts Antrobus, of Eaton Hall, Congleton, Esq.
CORNWALL—Edward Coode, of St. Austell, Esq.
CUMBERLAND—Sir Robert Briscoe, Bart.
DERBYSHIRE—Francis Westby Bagshawe, of The Oaks, Sheffield, Esq.
DEVONSHIRE—Sir A. P. B. Chichester, Bart.
DORSETSHIRE—Charles Joseph Parke, of Henbury, Esq.
DURHAM—Anthony Wilkinson, of Hulham, Esq.
ESSEX—William Charles Smith, of Shortgrove, Saffron Walden, Esq.
GLOUCESTERSHIRE—Hattil Foll, of Beckford Hall, Tewkesbury, Esq.
HEREFORDSHIRE—Tomkyns Dew, of Whitney Court, Hereford, Esq.
HERTFORDSHIRE—Robert Pryor, of High Elms, Watford, Esq.
KENT—Stephen Musgrave Hilton, of Bramling House, Ickham, Esq.
LANCASHIRE—Le Gendre Nicholas Starkie, of Huntroyde, Esq.
LEICESTERSHIRE—Ambrose Lisle March Phillips de Lisle, of Garendon Park, Loughborough, Esq.
LINCOLNSHIRE—John Wilson Fox, of Girsby House, Market Rasen, Esq.
MONMOUTHSHIRE—Frank Johnstone Mitchell, of Llanfrechfa Grange, Newport, Esq.

NORFOLK—The Right Hon. Thomas Heron, Viscount Ranelagh.
 NORTHAMPTONSHIRE—Henry De Stafford O'Brien, of Blatherwycke, Esq.
 NORTHUMBERLAND—John Blenkinsopp Coulson, of Blenkinsopp Castle, Esq.
 NOTTINGHAMSHIRE—John Hagshaw Taylor, of Radcliffe-upon-Trent, Esq.
 OXFORDSHIRE—William Earle Biscoe, of Holton Park, Esq.
 RUTLAND—Robert Heathcote, of North Luffenham, Esq.
 SHROPSHIRE—Charles Spencer Lloyd, of Leaton Knolls, Esq.
 SOMERSETSHIRE—Inigo William Jones, of Kelston Park, Esq.
 COUNTY OF SOUTHAMPTON—Sir Edward Hulse, Bart.
 STAFFORDSHIRE—James Timmins Chance, of Handsworth, Esq.
 SUFFOLK—Sir Charles James Fox, Bunbury, Bart.
 SURREY—Robert Carter, of The Grove, Epsom, Esq.
 SUSSEX—Henry Peter Crofts, of the Abbots, Sompting, Esq.
 WARWICKSHIRE—James Dugdale, of Wroxhall Abbey, Esq.
 WESTMORELAND—Thomas Tylour (commonly called Lord Kenlis), of Underley Hall, Kirkby Lonsdale, Esq.
 WILTSHIRE—Charles John Thomas Conolly, of Cottles House, Melksham, Esq.
 WORCESTERSHIRE—Charles Michael Berington, of Little Malvern Court, Esq.
 YORKSHIRE—Sir John William Ramsden, Bart.

WALES.

ANGLESEY—Henry Lambert, of Tan-y-Graig, Esq.
 BRECONSHIRE—John Evan Thomas, of Penishapentre, Esq.
 CARDIGANSHIRE—Alban Thomas Davies, of Tyglyn Aeron, Esq.
 CARMARTHENSHIRE—Charles William Nevill, of Westfa, Llanelly, Esq.
 CARMARVOŃSHIRE—Robert Sorton Parry, of Tan-y-Graig, Esq.
 DENBIGHSHIRE—Sir Robert Alfred Cunliffe, Bart.
 FLINTSHIRE—Richard Pelham Warren, of Hope Owen, Esq.
 GLAMORGANSHIRE—George Thomas Clark, of Talygarn, Esq.
 MERIONETHSHIRE—Richard John Lloyd Price, of Rhiwlas, Esq.
 MONTGOMERYSHIRE—William Fisher, of Maesfron, Esq.
 PEMBROKESHIRE—George Richards Graham Rees, of Penllwyn, Esq.
 RADNORSHIRE—Walter Thomas Mynors Baskerville, of Clyro, Esq.

UNIVERSITY HONOURS.

OXFORD.—CLASS LISTS.

Term Trin. 1868.

In Literis Humanioribus.

CLASSIS I.

Grose, Thomas H., Balliol.
 Hollings, Henry de B., Corpus.
 Mitchell, Andrew, Trinity.
 Reid, Robert T., Balliol.
 Spooner, Henry M., Balliol.

CLASSIS II.

Brown, Archibald, Ch. Ch.
 Mayo, Charles H., Lincoln.
 Nelson, George H., Queen's.
 Newman, William M., Balliol.
 Rose, Daniel, Balliol.
 Warden, William, Exeter.
 Willmot, Darwin, Magdalen.

CLASSIS III.

Armishaw, William, Magd. Hall.
 Banks, Edward G., Worcester.
 Boyle, Courtenay E., Ch. Ch.
 Coles, Vincent S. S., Balliol.
 Frere, William J., Magdalen.

In Scientiis Math. et Phys.

CLASSIS I.

Bromfield, Samuel W., Ch. Ch.
 Lewis, William J., Jesus.
 Threlfall, Thomas, Brasenose.

CLASSIS II.

Leeds, Charles E., Exeter.
 Scrymgeour, Edward P., Oriel.
 Tomlinson, Herbert, Ch. Ch.

CLASSIS III.

Cox, Hilgrove, Corpus.
 Rashleigh, Jonathan, Ch. Ch.

Hartshorne, Bertram F., Pemb.
 Jones, David, Jesus.
 Masterman, William, Wadham.
 Mozley, Francis W., New College.
 Spearman, Rudolph H., Oriel.

CLASSIS IV.

Bell, James, Queen's.
 Daniell, Reginald P., Exeter.
 Twyford, Thomas, Magdalen.

One hundred and forty-eight others
 passed.

Examiners.

W. Ince.
 C. S. Parker.
 S. H. Reynolds.
 W. W. Capes.

In Scientia Naturali.

CLASSIS I.

Lankester, Edwin R., Ch. Ch.
 Moseley, Henry N., Exeter.
 Smart, Edward R., Jesus.

CLASSIS II.

Reeves, Thomas J., Exeter.

CLASSIS III.

Meredith, Thomas, Exeter

CLASSIS IV.

Two others passed.

Examiners.

G. W. Child.
 A. G. V. Harcourt.
 R. B. Clifton.

CLASSIS IV.

Sixty-one others passed.

Examiners.

F. Harrison.
 W. Esson.
 H. Deane.

In Jurisprudentia et Hist. Mod.

CLASSIS I.

Charlton, Edward B., Ch. Ch.
 Johnson, Arthur H., Exeter.
 Phipson, Weatherley, Balliol.

CLASSIS II.

Jelf, George D., Ch. Ch.
 Montgomery, Hugo de F., Ch. Ch.
 Stourton, Henry J., Ch. Ch.
 Turner, Charles D., Trinity.
 Valpy, Robert A., Exeter.

CLASSIS III.

Baldwin, Edward T., Trinity.
 Cripps, Henry L., New College.
 Edwards, William G., Ch. Ch.
 Grey, Edward C. W., Ch. Ch.
 James, Walter H., Ch. Ch.
 Jorie, William F., Trinity.
 Neeld, Algernon W., Ch. Ch.
 Palmer, Greville H., Magdalen.
 Radcliffe, Edward, New Inn Hall.
 Samson, Edward, Ch. Ch.
 Silvester, John, Queen's.
 Toovey, Henry, Worcester.
 Verney, Frederick W., Ch. Ch.

CLASSIS IV.

Egerton, Charles A., Ch. Ch.
 Harper, Edward J., Pembroke.
 Kennedy, Arthur H., New Coll.

Forty-one others passed.

Examiners.

J. H. Ramsey.
 M. Burrows.
 T. E. Holland.

Term Mich. 1868.

In Literis Humanioribus.

CLASSIS I.

Davidson, Madgwick G., Ch. Ch.
 Gallop, Richard W., Lincoln.
 Hume, Francis G., Queen's.
 Knox, Edmund A., Corpus.
 Lang, Andrew, Balliol.
 Legard, Albert G., Balliol.
 Nutt, George, New Coll.
 Redington, Christopher T., Ch. Ch.
 Sayce, Archibald H., Queen's.
 Shadwell, Lionel L., New Coll.
 Ward, Thomas H., Brasenose.
 Williams, John H., Magdalen.

CLASSIS II.

Bagnold, Alexander B., Balliol.
 Bell, Alexander J. M., Balliol.
 Bond, John, St. John's.
 Copleston, Reginald S., Merton.
 Elliott, Albert A., Queen's.
 Farwell, George, Balliol.
 Hanbury, Robert W., Corpus.
 Horner, Henry B., Magdalen.
 Lloyd, John M. E., Trinity.
 Love, Reginald T., Oriel.
 Muir-Mackenzie, K. A., Balliol.
 Nicholson, Edward H., Balliol.
 Round, Francis R., Balliol.
 Sharkey, Lewis le H., Corpus.
 Taylor, Aubrey C. A., Balliol.
 Trevor, Henry E., Ch. Ch.

CLASSIS III.

Bartholomew, Francis M., Trinity.
 Brewerton, George, University.
 Clitty, Edward, Queen's.
 Crofts, William C., Brasenose.
 Davis, Montague P., Queen's.
 Dunlop, Charles J. T., Merton.
 Edwards, Robert J., Lincoln.
 Godby, Charles V., New Coll.
 Hookham, Frederick, Lincoln.
 Hughes, Thomas E., Wadham.
 Hutchison, Robert, Exeter.
 Jackson, Clement N., Magdalen Hall.
 Leach, George P., St. John's.
 Mackey, Arthur J., Ch. Ch.
 Parsons, Fred. W., Magdalen.
 Peck, Philip, Wadham.
 Prichard, Charles C., Brasenose.
 Rawnsley, Willingham F., Corpus.
 Robertson, Thomas S., Balliol.
 Smith, Henry U., Brasenose.
 Stuart, William C., Merton.
 Toye, William J., University.
 Walker, George H. D., New Coll.
 Wilkinson, Josiah, Queen's.
 Willan, James N., Pembroke.

In Scientiis Math. et Phys.

CLASSIS I.

Chadwick, William, Merton.
 Gamble, James S., Magdalen.
 Grose, Thomas H., Balliol.
 Sampson, Edward F., St. John's.
 Talbot, Frederick H., Ch. Ch.

CLASSIS II.

Archibald, William F., St. John's.
 Lambert, Percival B., Queen's.
 Richardson, William M., Merton.

CLASSIS III.

CLASSIS IV.

Ball, Frederick J., Pembroke.
 Beaven, Alfred, Pembroke.
 Bencke, Albert H., Brasenose.
 Burgess, William R., Queen's.
 Eyton, Robert, Ch. Ch.
 Hope, Edward S., Ch. Ch.
 Mollat, William, Worcester.
 Sweeting, Henry E., Pembroke.

Eighty-six others passed.

Examiners.

G. Rawlinson.
 F. W. Walker.
 G. E. Thorley.
 W. W. Capes.

In Scientia Naturali.

CLASSIS I.

Conroy, John, Ch. Ch.

CLASSIS II.

Beecroft, George A. B., Ch. Ch.
 Bowyer, Robert W., Queen's.
 Donkin, William F., Magdalen.
 Jermyn, Edmund, Ch. Ch.
 Stephenson, Henry S. G., Queen's.
 Threlfall, Thomas, Brasenose.

CLASSIS III.

Glanville, John U., Exeter.

● CLASSIS IV.

Examiners.

G. W. Child.
 A. G. V. Harcourt.
 R. B. Clifton.

CLASSIS IV.

Ninety-nine others passed.

Examiners.

F. Harrison.
 D. Thomas.
 H. Deane.

In Jurisprudentia et Hist. Mod.

CLASSIS I.

CLASSIS II.

Alleyne, Foster McG., Merton.
 Beaven, Alfred, Pembroke.
 Clark, Gerard C., University.
 Cope, Herbert F., Balliol.
 Gribbon, Walter G., St. John's.
 Gwyther, Alfred, Ch. Ch.
 Hoskins, James T., Oriel.
 Jones, Oliver H., Exeter.
 Mitchell, Andrew, Trinity.
 Molineux, Arthur E., Ch. Ch.
 Richardson, Henry, Corpus.
 Richardson, Murray S., Ch. Ch.

CLASSIS III.

Adderley, Charles L., Ch. Ch.
 Ashmore, Fitzroy P., University.
 Bell, James, Queen's.
 Birley, Hugh A., Pembroke.
 Bonham, Sir G. F., Bart., Exeter.
 Braithwaite, Robert, Wadham.
 Briggs, Thomas H., St. John's.
 Cotes, Charles C., Ch. Ch.
 Deane, Henry B., Balliol.
 Lewis-Mansel, Charles W., Balliol.
 Raikes, William A., Oriel.
 Robinson, Francis W., Worcester.
 Stanhope, Hon. Henry A., Ch. Ch.
 Venables, Gilbert, Wadham.
 Woodgate, Gordon, Pembroke.

CLASSIS IV.

Edwards, John W., Worcester.
 Somervell, James, Magdalen Hall.

Thirty-seven others passed.

Examiners.

J. H. Ramsay.
 M. Burrows.
 T. E. Holland.

MODERATIONS.

Term Trin. 1868.

In Litt. Gr. et Lat.

I.

Barnwell, Charles E. B., Ch. Ch.
 Clarke, Robert L., Balliol.
 Cruttwell, Charles T., St. John's.
 Forster, Arthur S., New College.
 Godley, John A., Balliol.
 Greg, Favour J., Balliol.
 Hardy, Reginald E., Balliol.
 Heard, William A., Trinity.
 Jervis, George W., Ch. Ch.
 Jendwine, George W., Corpus.
 Kenyon, Hon. Wm. T., Ch. Ch.
 Richards, Franklin T., Queen's.
 Richards, Herbert P., Balliol.
 Shattock, George, St. John's.
 Theobald, Henry S., Balliol.

II.

Almack, Alfred C., Worcester.
 Bidder, Henry J., University.
 Brackenbury, M. J. F., New Coll.
 Brock, William, Magdalen.
 Buckland, Charles E., Balliol.
 Cremer, Frederick D., Wadham.
 Crocker, Arthur, Trinity.
 Digby, Reginald, New Coll.
 Druitt, Robert, Ch. Ch.
 Ewing, Robert, Balliol.
 Fowler, William W., Lincoln.
 Freeman, John T., Brasenose.
 Gilliat, Howard, University.
 Hartley, John F., Brasenose.
 Hodgson, James T., University.
 Humble, William J., Exeter.
 Lesley, James, Pembroke.
 Lindsell, William H. B., Corpus.
 Lovell, William, Exeter.
 Matthew, Walter E., St. John's.
 Merry, George R., Lincoln.
 Moncrieff, Frederick C., New Coll.
 Morgan, Edward S., Lincoln.
 Morice, Francis D., New Coll.
 Rankine, Adam, Balliol.
 Ritchie, Francis, Lincoln.
 Rooper, Thomas G., Balliol.
 Russell, Spencer C., Corpus.
 Sharpe, Reginald R., St. John's.
 Thompson, James E., Wadham.
 Thorold, George A. W., Exeter.
 Tupper, Charles L., Corpus.
 Turner, George K., New Coll.
 Wilson, Francis H., University.

• III.

Ady, William H., Exeter.
 Bagot, Lewis R. C., Wadham.
 Bazalgette, Charles N., Magdalen.
 Coleridge, Ernest H., Balliol.

In Disco. Math.

I.

Chisol, Thomas A. A., Exeter.
 Clarke, Robert L., Balliol.
 Harrison, John B., Queen's.
 Morris, Samuel S. O., Jesus.
 Muir, Robert J., Magdalen.
 Muir-Mackenzie, M. J., Brasenose.
 Shattock, George, St. John's.

II.

Buckland, Charles E., Balliol.
 Hull, Herbert E., Brasenose.
 Sparks, Frederick, Worcester.
 Theobald, Henry S., Balliol.

III.

Copleston, Edward G., Ch. Ch.
 Croome, William M., Trinity.
 Edwards, Arthur W., University.
 Graham, Francis R. M., Lincoln.
 Greenwell, William J., New Coll.
 Gregory Robert S., Trinity.
 Grosvenor, Richard C., Balliol.
 Harries, Hadrian, Worcester.
 Hughes, Joshua P., Balliol.
 Jackson, Wm. A., St. Mary Hall.
 Kenyon, Robert L., Ch. Ch.
 Mackenzie, Andrew M., Corpus.
 Mozley, Alfred D., Jesus.
 Steward, Arthur B., Magdalen.
 Symonds, Edward, Exeter.
 Taylor, Ernest G., Wadham.
 Taylor, Robert F., Ch. Ch.
 Waite, Francis U., Balliol.
 White, Alfred C., Ch. Ch.

Moderators.

LITT. GR. ET LAT.	DISC. MATH.
C. W. Sandford.	Barth. Price.
H. F. Tozer.	T. H. R. Shand.
J. Y. Sargent.	C. L. Dodgson.
R. S. Wright	

Term. Mich. 1868.

In Litt. Gr. et Lat.

I.

Belcher, Thomas H., Queen's.
 Bosanquet, Bernard, Balliol.
 Bromley, Thomas M., Merton.
 Cotton, James, S. Trinity.
 Dundas, Charles L., Brasenose.
 Irwin, Henry C., Queen's.
 Monro, Alexander, Oriel.
 Robertson, Edmund, Lincoln.
 Smith, Stuart C. F., Magdalen Hall.
 Stewart, John A., Lincoln.
 Tatton, Robert G., Balliol.

II.

Acland, Arthur H. D., Ch. Ch.
 Bathe, Anthony, Brasenose.
 Bell, Frederic, University.
 Bone, William M., Pembroke.
 Brown, Willoughby B., Brasenose.
 Campbell, Charles C., Jesus.
 Chadwick, Thomas L., Queen's.
 Chamberlen, Lawrence J., Brasenose.
 Chapman, George W., Ch. Ch.
 Clarke, William A., Magdalen.
 Cohen, James I., Worcester.
 Croasdill, William, Pembroke.
 Eade, Edwin A., New coll.
 Eveleigh-Wyndham, E. J., Corpus.
 Garbett, Charles A., Magdalen Hall.
 Greenville-Murray, Douglas N. W. E. C.,
 Ch. Ch.
 Gresswell, Wm. H. P., Brasenose.
 Harrison, Denwood, Queen's.
 Hastings, Alfred G., Corpus.
 Hodge, Edward V., Balliol.
 Humphreys, Walter, New Coll.
 Moore, Thomas, Brasenose.
 Paulson, William H., Magdalen.
 Prichard, Francis A., Pembroke.
 Schuster, Edmund V., Trinity.

In Disc. Math.

I.

Bromby, Edward H., Queen's.
 Ewing, Robert, Balliol.
 Mozley, Alfred D., Jesus.

II.

Diggle, John, Merton.
 Edwards, Arthur E., University.
 Jeffreys, Arthur F., Ch. Ch.
 Walker, John R., Exeter.

Sharkey, Seymour J., Jesus.
 Stoker, Henry E., Pembroke.
 Thompson, William E., Ch. Ch.
 Weidemann, George L., Oriel.
 Wilkison, Ernest, Merton.
 Wimple, Henry, Queen's.

III.

Balston, William E., University.
 Borrer, Francis H., Oriel.
 Burnaby, Evelyn H. V., Lincoln.
 Cross, James, Exeter.
 Dawson, Stewart, University.
 Dayman, Walter W., Exeter.
 Denison, Henry P., Ch. Ch.
 Devas, William F., Magdalen.
 Donoughmore, Earl of, Balliol.
 Downer, Arthur C., Brasenose.
 Edwards, Thomas, Jesus.
 Gibson, John F., New College.
 Guillemard, Walter G., New College.
 Horman, Duhamel, Lincoln.
 Jackson, Charles W., Exeter.
 Linton, Edward F., University.
 Lloyd-Jones, John, Jesus.
 Midwinter, Henry N., Worcester.
 Mills, George K., Queen's.
 Morgan, John, Jesus.
 Povah, John R., University.
 Sandbach, Gilbert R., Brasenose.
 Thomson, Thomas K., Exeter.
 Ward, Richard, Trinity.
 Williams, Pownoll, Balliol.
 Wordsworth, Chas. S., University.

III.

Cox, Alfred V., Wadham.
 Mort, Henry W., Queen's.
 Phillimore, Arthur, Oriel.
 Taylor, Francis W., University.
 Wilson, Roderic J., Magdalen.

Moderators.

LITT. GR. ET LAT.	DISC. MATH.
C. W. Sandford.	Barth. Price.
J. Y. Sargent.	T. H. R. Shand.
J. R. King.	F. S. Evans.
R. S. Wright.	

CAMBRIDGE.

MATHEMATICAL TRIPOS.

MODERATORS.

Percival Frost, M.A., John's.
 Robert Baldwin Hayward, M.A., John's.

EXAMINERS.

Arthur Cockshott, M.A., Trinity.
 Anthony William Wilson Steele, M.A., Caius.

WRANGLERS¹.

Ds. *Moulton² (1), John's.
 *Darwin (2), Trinity.
 *Smith, Sidney.
 Christie, Trinity.
 Watson, Jesus.
 { Griffith β , John's.
 { *Haynes, Queens'.
 { Verdon β , John's.

*Buckley, Christ's.
 *Carpenter, Trinity H.
 *James, Caius.
 Watson, John's.
 Meaden, Emmanuel.
 Obbard, John's.
 { Hopkinson, Christ's.
 { Swettenham γ , Trinity.

¹ In all cases of equality the names are bracketed. The figures (1) and (2) denote respectively the Senior and Junior Smith's prizemen. α denotes that the person was in the first class of the Classical Tripos; β , in the second; γ , in the third. The * denotes the Fellows of Colleges.

² Fellow of Christ's.

Day, Emmanuel.
 Kirkby (Bagnall-Wild), Caius.
 Gaskell β , Trinity.
 Williams, Trinity.
 Stevelly, Peter's.
 Hetherington α (β), Trinity.
 Thornton, Jesus.
 Henry, Caius.
 Holditch, John's.
 Bourne β , John's.
 { Airy, Trinity.
 { Duguid, Trinity.
 Farrer, Pembroke.

Patterson, Christ's.
 { Karman, Sidney.
 { Lewis γ , Trinity.
 { Herbert, Catherine's.
 { Jackson γ , Jesus.
 { Wright, G. E., Pembroke.
 Hagreen, Trinity.
 Harvey, Peter's.
 { Lester, John's.
 { Marshall, John's.
 { Ebsworth, Clare.
 { Wright, Queens'.
 Shann, Trinity.

SENIOR OPTIMES.

Ds. { Brook Smith, John's.
 { Tomlinson, Trinity.
 Hughes, Jesus.
 Wright, T. R., Pembroke.
 { Bayley, Jesus.
 { Chesshire, Trinity.
 { Knight β , Trinity.
 { Whitborne γ , Corpus.
 { Bovell, Magdalen.
 { Sutton, Christ's.
 Luck, John's.
 { Ellis, John's.
 { Hogg, Christ's.
 { Barnes, Peter's.
 { Watts, Trinity.

{ Browne β , Emmanuel.
 { Jackson, Trinity.
 { Nelson, Corpus.
 Gribble, Trinity.
 { Beal, Trinity II.
 { O'Connor, Peter's.
 { Raunyard, Pembroke.
 { Turner, Trinity.
 Morgan, Sidney.
 Collier, Corpus.
 { Bamber, Trinity.
 { Collard, John's.
 Braithwaite, John's.
 Lloyd β , John's.
 Taylor α (A), Trinity.

JUNIOR OPTIMES.

Ds. Abbott γ , Trinity.
 Sparkes β , John's.
 Elliott, Hon. A. R. D., Trinity.
 { Greenwood, Catherine's.
 { Mason, Corpus.
 Wood, Hon. F. G. L., Trinity.
 Sams, Peter's.
 Kelly, Catherine's.
 Stubbs, Sidney.
 { Gannon, John's.
 { Johnson, Magdalene.
 Hyett, Trinity H.
 Norrie, Trinity.
 { Haig, Caius.
 { Stoddart, John's.

Laidman, John's.
 Rigg, Trinity.
 Shuter, Corpus.
 Eaton, Emmanuel.
 Whiteley, John's.
 { Thomas, John's.
 { Wingate, Peter's.
 Taylor, Queens'.
 Bower, John's.
 Harland, Clare.
 Atkinson γ , John's.
 Hackblock, Trinity.
 Pinckney, Trinity.
 Esdaile, Peter's.
 Nadin, Pembroke.

CLASSICAL TRIPOS.

EXAMINERS.

Francis Cotterell Hodgson, M.A., King's.
 John Peile, M.A., Christ's.
 Alfred George Day, M.A., Caius.
 Richard Claverhouse Jebb, M.A., Trinity.
 Henry Carr Archdale Tayler, M.A., Trinity.
 Charles Walter Moule, M.A., Corpus.

FIRST CLASS².

Ds. 4 *Kennedy, King's.
 *Cullinan, Christ's.
 Rawlins, Trinity.
 *Moss, John's.
 Wilkins, John's.
 Stogdon, Clare.
 Blakesley, King's.
 Iremonger, Clare.
 Fynes Clinton, John's.
 Lewis, Corpus.

Stewart, Trinity.
 Haslam, John's.
 Reed, Trinity.
 Hetherington (B), Trinity.
 Tarring, Trinity.
 Taylor (A), Trinity.
 Fitzmaurice, Lord E., Trinity.
 Tabor, King's.

SECOND CLASS.

Ds. { Goodford, Trinity.
 { Lloyd, John's.
 { Upton, Trinity.
 { Warner, Pembroke.
 { Davies, Christ's.
 { Hales, Christ's.
 { Johnson, Christ's.
 { Almack, John's.
 { Fry, Pembroke.
 { Leech, Emmanuel's.
 { Baddeley, Clare.
 { Hare, Emmanuel.
 { Rowe, Christ's.
 { Colvill, Trinity.
 { Grenside, Queens'.
 { Salusbury, Catherine.
 { Damant, Christ's.
 { Eyre, Clare.

Verdon, John's.
 Griffith, John's.
 Wilson, Emmanuel.
 Browne, Emmanuel.
 Hollins, Emmanuel.
 Pearson, John's.
 Rand, Caius.
 Deeley, Emmanuel.
 Oakley, Trinity.
 Gaskell, Trinity.
 Sparkes, John's.
 Bourne, John's.
 Irvine, Corpus.
 Hussey, Trinity.
 Knight, Trinity.
 Ottley, Emmanuel.
 Wood, Clare.

THIRD CLASS.

Ds. { Melvill, Trinity.
 { Tipping, Trinity.
 { Brenner, Trinity.
 { Lewis, Trinity.
 { Woodrooffe, Emmanuel.
 { Lane, Trinity.
 { Jones, Magdalen.
 { Lucas, Trinity.
 { Swettenham, Trinity.
 { Jefferson, Trinity.

Tomlins, Magdalen.
 Jackson, Jesus.
 La Mothe, Corpus.
 Jukes, Trinity.
 Hobson, Sidney.
 Whidborne, Corpus.
 Abbot, Trinity.
 Thwaites, Trinity.
 Atkinson John's.
 Mickelthwaite, Peter's.

MORAL SCIENCES TRIPOS.

EXAMINERS.

John Frederick Denison Maurice, M.A., Trinity.
 Thomas Webster, M.A., Trinity.
 Fenton John Anthony Hort, M.A., Trinity.
 Frederick William Henry Myers, M.A., Trinity.

FIRST CLASS.

Verdon, John's.
 Armitage, Trinity.
 Elwin, Catherine's.

{ Fayle, Trinity H.
 { Fox, Trinity.

* (A) and (B) denote respectively the First and Second "Chancellor's Medallist."

* Fellow of Pembroke.

SECOND CLASS.

{	Brown, Pembroke.
	Lee Warner, John's.
	Mansfield, John's.

THIRD CLASS.

Abbot, Trinity.
Stewart, Trinity.
Collins, Corpus.
Trimmer, Caius.

	Cox, Trinity.
	Orr, John's.
	Shepherd, Jesus.
	Hopper, John's.

NATURAL SCIENCES TRIPOS.

EXAMINERS.

Osmond Fisher, M.A., Jesus.
George Henslow, M.A., Christ's.
Philip Thomas Main, M.A., John's.
John Buckley Bradbury, M.A., Downing.

SECOND CLASS.

Higgins, Downing.
Moore, Catherine's.

	{	Cory, Pembroke.
		Penny, Caius.

THIRD CLASS.

{	Holditch, John's.
	Monckton, Caius.

	Roe, Downing.
--	---------------

THEOLOGICAL EXAMINATION.—EASTER, 1868.

EXAMINERS.

J. A. Jeremie, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity.
W. Selwyn, D.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity.
T. R. Birks, M.A., Trinity.
W. R. Churton, M.A., King's.
J. M. Fuller, M.A., John's.
A. Holmes, M.A., Clare.

MIDDLE BACHELORS.

FIRST CLASS.

*Gwatkin †, John's.

SECOND CLASS.

Bodkin, King's.
Boys, Emmanuel.

	Honeyburne, Catherine's.
--	--------------------------

THIRD CLASS.

Amps, Emmanuel.
Clark, Corpus.
Crosbie, Trinity.
Cussons, Catherine's.

	Dyce, Trinity.
	Harvey, C. W., Trinity.
	Hindley, Sidney.

† Distinguished in Hebrew; Hebrew Prize; Scholefield Prize for Biblical Greek.

COMMENCING BACHELORS.

SECOND CLASS.

Fox ⁶, Christ's.

THIRD CLASS.

Black, Christ's.

LAW TRIPOS.

EXAMINERS.

J. T. Abdy, LL.D., Regius Professor of Laws.

George Young, M.A., Trinity.

A. C. Humphreys, M.A., Trinity.

R. Romer, M.A., Trinity H.

FIRST CLASS.

Sayer, Trinity H.

	{ Inverarity, Trinity.
	{ Norton, Trinity H.

SECOND CLASS.

Riley, Trinity H.
Bovell, Magdalene.

	{ Hodges, Trinity H.
	{ Martin, Trinity H.
	{ Tabor, King's.

THIRD CLASS.

Cooper, Trinity H.
{ Gray, Trinity.
{ Kennett, Trinity.

	Lothouse, Trinity H.
	Rigg, Trinity.
	Irving, Trinity.

⁶ Distinguished in Hebrew.

INDEX.

N.B. The figures between [] refer to Part I.

- ABBEY MILLS Pumping Station, opening of, 94
- ABERGELE, ACCIDENT to Irish Mail Train near, 106, [188].
- ABYSSINIAN EXPEDITION, Successful result of, [139]; Thanks of both Houses of Parliament voted to the General Commanding, the officers, and men, [140]; Sir Robert Napier created a Peer, [142]; narrative of events preceding, [233]; Sir Robert Napier selected to command the Expedition, [235]; Engagement with King Theodore's troops, [243]; Release of the captives, [*ib.*]; Attack on Magdala, [*ib.*]; Death of the King, [244]; Sir Robert Napier's address to the Army, [*ib.*]; Return of Expedition, [245].
- ACADEMY, *vide* ROYAL ACADEMY.
- ACCIDENTS.—Fall of old sugar house at Hull, 122; Fatal panic at a Manchester Music Hall, 94; Fall of a warehouse at Liverpool, 139; Falling-in of a house at Rochdale, 155.—*Vide* EXPLOSION, FIRES, RAILWAY.
- ACCIDENTS AND DISASTERS, [187].
- ACCOUNTS, PUBLIC. Income and Expenditure of the year, 248.
- ADAM, MR., becomes one of the Lords of the Treasury, [177].
- ADMIRAL, LORD HIGH, Right Hon. H. T. Corry and others Commissioners for executing office of, 252.
- ADMIRALTY ADMINISTRATION. — Mr. Seeley's motion for a Select Committee, [113]; Mr. Corry's reply, [114]; Committee appointed, [*ib.*]; Mr. Graves' motion for diminution of Dockyards, [*ib.*]; withdrawn, [115].
- AFRICA (WEST) SETTLEMENTS, Sir A. E. Kennedy appointed Governor, 250.
- "ALABAMA," THE, CLAIMS.—History of, [125]; Discussion in House of Commons, Mr. G. Shaw-Lefevre's speech, [126]; Lord Stanley's speech, [127]; Mr. Mill's, [129]; Mr. Gladstone's, [130]; Discussions in House of Lords originated by Earl Russell, [*ib.*]; opinions expressed by the Lord Chancellor, [131]; and Lord Westbury, [132].
- ALFRED (PRINCE), *vide* DUKE OF EDINBURGH.
- AGRARIAN MURDERS in Tipperary, 101.
- AILESBURY, MARQUIS OF, becomes Master of the Horse, [177].
- APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS AND, 250.
- ARGENTINE REPUBLIC, Hon. W. Stuart appointed Minister to, 250.
- ARGYLL, DUKE OF, becomes Secretary for India, [176].
- ARGYLL, DUCHESS OF, becomes Mistress of the Robes, [177].
- ARMY ESTIMATES, moved by Sir John Pakington, [115]; carried, [117].
- ARROW, FREDERICK, Knighted, 252.
- ART, Retrospect of, [308].
- ARTHUR, PRINCE, at Woolwich, 75; at the Royal Volunteer Review at Windsor, 78; appointed a Lieutenant in the Royal Engineers, 251.
- ASCOT CUP DAY, 71.
- ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE, Religious riots at, 55.
- AYTOUN'S, MR. SINCLAIR, resolution as to Maynooth Grant and the *Regium Donum*, [91].
- AYRTON, MR., becomes one of the Secretaries of the Treasury, [177].
- AUSTRALIA, WESTERN, Sir B. C. C. Pine appointed Governor, 252.
- AUSTRIA, [224]; Abolition of the Concordat, [226]; New Titles of the Emperor and of the State, [227].

- BACON, JAMES**, Commissioner in Court of Bankruptcy, 252.
- BAGGALLAY, RICHARD**, Solicitor-General, 252; Knighted, 254.
- BANKRUPTCY, COURT OF**, James Bacon appointed Commissioner, 252.
- BARNSELY, Explosion at a Firework manufactory**, 130.
- BARRETT, MICHAEL**, Capture, 2; Execution, 63; narrative of Trial, 174.
- BARRY, MR. SERJEANT**, becomes Solicitor-General for Ireland, [177].
- BAXTER, MR.**, motion to disenfranchise boroughs in England carried, [23], *vide* SCOTLAND; becomes Secretary to the Admiralty, [177].
- BEECH, SIR MICHAEL HICKS**, Secretary to the Poor Law Board, [9].
- BELL, SYDNEY SMITH**, Chief Justice of Cape of Good Hope, 254.
- BERMUDA FLOATING DOCK**, Launch of, 113.
- BERNE, R. T. C.** Middleton to be Secretary of Legation at, 250; H. E. C. K. Seymer Secretary of Legation at, 252.
- BERRYER M.**, death of, [211]; obituary notice, 159.
- BESSBOROUGH, THE EARL OF**, becomes Lord Steward, [177].
- BEUST, BARON**, defended by Count Bismarck in Prussian Chamber [223]; his position and that of Lord Stanley, [226]; speech on the Foreign Policy of Austria, [*ib.*].
- BIOGRAPHY**, Works of, [286]; less important works, [298].
- BIRMINGHAM**, Meeting of the Social Science Association at, 124.
- BISMARCK, COUNT**, Speech in vindication of Baron Beust, [223].
- BLACKALL, S. W.**, appointed Governor of Queensland, 251.
- BLACKBURN, MR. JUSTICE**, Charge in case of Mr. Eyre, ex-Governor of Jamaica, in Queen's Bench, 206.
- BLACKBURN, Political Riots at**, 135.
- BOUNDARY BILL FOR ENGLAND AND WALES**, Report of Commissioners presented, [30]; discussed in House of Commons, [31]; referred to a Select Committee, [33]; report brought up by Mr. Walpole, [*ib.*]; Bill brought in, [34]; Mr. Hibbert's amendment approving of recommendations of Select Committee [35]; carried, [36]; Bill passed, [*ib.*]; in House of Lords, [*ib.*]; Earl Beauchamp moved an amendment in accordance with original Report of Commissioners, [*ib.*]; Earl Granville protested, and after discussion, along with the principal members of the Opposition, left the House, [*ib.*]; Bill passed, [37].
- BOUVERIE, MR.**, Speech on present position of parties, [18]; motion on rate-paying qualifications, [23], *vide* SCOTLAND.
- BOW**, Disaster at, 8.
- BRAUN'S, M.**, Carbon process, [328].
- BRETT, WILLIAM BALIOL**, knighted, 250; Justice of Common Pleas, 252.
- BREWSTER, SIR DAVID**, Obituary notice of, 160.
- BRIDGEMAN, HON. REV. G. T.** Honorary Chaplain to her Majesty, 250.
- BRIDGES, SIR BROOK WILLIAM**, created Baron Fitzwalter, 251.
- BRIGHT, MR.**, becomes President of the Board of Trade, [176]; speech on reelection at Birmingham, [83]; a Privy Councillor, 253.
- BRIGHT, REV. W.**, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, 253.
- BRITISH ASSOCIATION**, Annual Meeting at Norwich, [343], 103.
- BRITISH GUIANA**, Sir W. Snagg, Chief Justice, 254.
- BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION**, Meeting at Oxford, 97.
- BRITISH MUSEUM**, the Slade Collection of glass, &c., [326]; prints and drawings recently acquired, [327].
- BRITISH SUBJECTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, ALLEGIANCE.**—Subject introduced in House of Commons by Mr. Forster and discussed, [132]; Report of Royal Commission on Laws of Naturalization and Allegiance, 237.
- BROOKE, SIR JAMES**, Obituary Notice of, 162.
- BROUGHAM, LORD**, Obituary Notice of, 163.
- BRUCE, MR. H. A.** becomes Secretary for the Home Department, [176].
- BRUSSELS, Hon. F. J. Pakenham**, Secretary to Legation at, 251.
- BUCKINGHAM, DUKE OF**, appointed Lord Lieutenant of Co. of Buckingham, 251.
- BUDGET**, introduced by Mr. Ward Hunt, [108]; Indian, exhibited by Sir Stafford Northcote, [123]; French, [192].
- BURLINGTON HOUSE**, The Royal Academy's meeting for first time in their new rooms at, [330].
- CABMEN**, strike among the London, 118.
- CAIRNS, LORD**, becomes Lord Chancellor, [9]; Speech on Irish Church Question, [105].
- CAMBRIDGE, UNIVERSITY OF.**—Mr. Longfellow had the degree of LL.D. conferred, 74; Honour Lists, 267.
- CANTERBURY, ARCHBISHOP OF**, Confirmation of Dr. Tait, 157; obituary notice of Dr. Longley, 165; appointment of Dr. Tait, Bishop of London, 253.
- CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.**—Edward Dwyer appointed a Puisne Judge, 251; Sir W.

- Snagg appointed Chief Justice, 254; C. T. Smith appointed a Puisne Judge, 254.
- CARBON PROCESS OF M. Braun, [328].
- CARDIGAN, EARL OF, Obituary notice of, 166.
- CARDWELL, MR., becomes Secretary of War, [176].
- CARROLL, WILLIAM, M.D., Lord Mayor of Dublin, knighted, 251.
- CARTIER, GEORGE ETIENNE, created a baronet, 252.
- CHANCELLOR, LORD, Lord Cairns appointed, [9]; Lord Hatherley appointed, [176].
- CHANCERY, Sir C. J. Selwyn appointed Judge of Appeal, 250; Vice-Chancellor Sir W. Page Wood appointed Judge of Appeal, *ib.*; George Markham Giffard appointed a Vice-Chancellor, *ib.*
- CHAMPNEYS, REV. CANON, to be Dean of Lichfield, 253.
- CHILMSFORD, LORD, succeeded in the office of Lord Chancellor by Lord Cairns, [9].
- CHILD, SMITH, created a baronet, 253.
- CHILDERS, MR., moves amendment on Navy Estimates, [113]; becomes First Lord of the Admiralty, [176]; a Privy Councillor, 253.
- CHURCH CONGRESS at Dublin, [124].
- CHURCH, IRISH, *vide* IRELAND.
- CHURCH IN WEST INDIES, Disendowment of, [165], *vide* WEST INDIES.
- CHURCH-KATE ABOLITION BILL.—Introduced by Mr. Gladstone, [147]; read a second time, passed through Committee, and third reading affirmed, [148]; in House of Lords referred to a Select Committee, [149]; effect of alterations by Committee stated and accepted by Lord Russell, [*ib.*]; agreed to by Lord Derby, [151]; protest by Bishops, [152]; passed, [153]; amendments by Peers accepted by Commons, and Bill became law, [153].
- CIVIL SERVICE.—Estimates introduced and passed [121]; Mr. Childers' motion for re-organization, [*ib.*]; opposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and withdrawn, [123].
- CLARENDON, EARL OF, becomes Secretary for Foreign Affairs, [176].
- CLEASBY, ANTHONY, Baron of Exchequer, 252; knighted, 254.
- COBDEN MEMORIAL, THE, in Camden Town inaugurated, [80].
- COLERIDGE, MR. J. D., introduces University Tests Abolition Bill, [160]; second reading carried, [163]; but further progress stopped from pressure of business, [*ib.*]; becomes Solicitor-General, [177]; Knighted, 254.
- COLLIER, SIR R., becomes Attorney-General, [177].
- COLLISION in the Channel, [102].
- COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS during year reviewed, [185].
- COMMONS, LIST OF NEW HOUSE OF, [255].
- COMMON PLEAS, Sir W. B. Brett appointed Justice, [252].
- "COMPOUND HOUSEHOLDER" Difficulty, six thousand persons summoned at Hackney, [21].
- COOKE'S, MR. E. W., collection of glass, [325].
- CORK, EARL OF, becomes Master of the Buckhounds, [177].
- CORRY, MR., moves Navy Estimates, [111].
- CRAWFORTH, LORD, Obituary notice of, [167].
- CRETAN INSURRECTION, Debate in House of Lords, [133]; Narrative of, [232].
- CRICKET MATCH, Eton and Harrow, 83.
- CRYSTAL PALACE.—Suicide from the Tower, 18; Handel Triennial Festival, 72; Festival to Welcome Prince Alfred, 81.
- CUMBERLAND AND WESTMORLAND, Henry Lowther appointed Lord-Lieutenant of, 253.
- DACRES, VICE-ADMIRAL SIR S. C., becomes one of the Junior Lords of the Admiralty, [177].
- "DAILY TELEGRAPH," Action for Libel, Risk Allah v., 217.
- DEATHS of Eminent Persons, [188].
- DE GREY AND RIPON, LORD, becomes Lord President of the Council, [176].
- DENISON, MR. J. EVELYN, elected Speaker of the new House of Commons, [179].
- DENMARK, [231].
- DENMARK, The Crown Prince of, at Ascot, [71]; at Oxford, [74].
- DERBY, EARL, resigns the Premiership, [8]; calls attention in House of Lords to Mr. Gladstone's resolutions on Irish Church, [76]; Speech on the same, [99].
- DEBBY, THE, won by Blue Gown, [65].
- DISRAELI, MR., succeeds Lord Derby as Premier, [8]; Speech at Meeting of Conservative Members [9]; statement in House, [11]; statement of interview with the Queen after the carrying of Mr. Gladstone's first resolution on Irish Church, and course proposed by Government, [84]; letter to supporters intimating resignation of Government [174]; presides at Annual Dinner of Literary Fund, 53; Speech at Mansion House, 145.
- DISRAELI, MRS., created Viscountess Beaconsfield, 253.
- DOCK, Launch of Bermuda floating, 113.
- DOCKS, Opening of new, at Millwall, 28.

- DOCKYARDS, MR. GRAVES'** motion for the diminution of, [114]; withdrawn, [*ib.*]
- DORIA, WILLIAM,** to be Secretary to Legation at Lisbon, 250.
- DOYLE, JOHN**—(H. B.)—death of, [330].
- DROWNING** of seven pupils when bathing near Christchurch, 62.
- DUBLIN,** visit of Prince and Princess of Wales, 40; Church Congress at, 124; arrival of Earl Spencer, new Lord Lieutenant, 154; William Carroll, M.D., Lord Mayor of, knighted, 251.
- DUFF, MR. GRANT,** becomes Under-Secretary for India, [177].
- DUFFERIN, LORD,** becomes Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, [177].
- DURHAM, County Palatine of, J. R. Quain,** Attorney-General, 252.
- DWYER, EDWARD,** appointed Puisne Judge at Cape of Good Hope, 251.
- EARTHQUAKE,** Shock of an, 2; in Peru and Ecuador, 99; in England, 139; in various parts of the world, [187].
- ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES ACT** of 1850, Earl Stanhope's motion for a Select Committee upon its operation, [45]; discussion, [46]; Committee nominated, and their Report, [*ib.*]
- ECLIPSE OF THE SUN,** [331].
- EDINBURGH, THE DUKE OF.**—Attempt to assassinate, near Sydney, 25; arrival home, 79; Festival at Crystal Palace to welcome, 81; at the Volunteer Review at Wimbledon, 90; addresses of sympathy to the Queen from both Houses of Parliament, [143]; speech at Sydney, [145].
- EDINBURGH, Terrific gale** at, 5.
- EDUCATION,** Annual vote for, moved by Lord Robert Montagu, and discussion, [158].
- EDUCATION, NATIONAL.**—Bill brought in by Mr. H. A. Bruce, [154]; a measure on behalf of the Government introduced into the House of Lords by the Duke of Marlborough, [155]; read a second time, [157]; withdrawn, [158]; Mr. Bruce's Bill also withdrawn, [*ib.*]
- EDWARDES, SIR HERBERT,** Obituary notice of, 168.
- EGERTON, LORD,** Lord-Lieutenant co. Chester, 250.
- ELCHO, LORD,** motion for a Royal Commission on Military Organization, [117].
- ELECTION, GENERAL,** writs issued and elections rapidly proceeded with, [171]; aggregate results, [*ib.*]; total votes recorded, [174].
- ELECTION PETITIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL.**—Report of Select Committee of 1867, [38]; objections by the Judges to the transference of jurisdiction to them, [39]; Bill introduced, with proposition to create a special tribunal, and discussion, [*ib.*]; second reading moved, [40]; substituting another plan, [*ib.*]; in Committee, [*ib.*]; the principle of the Bill affirmed by a division of 178 to 158; new modification proposed by Mr. Disraeli, [41]; made applicable to England and Scotland, [42]; read a third time, [*ib.*]; passed by House of Lords, [*ib.*]
- ENGLAND, History of the year,** [1].
- EPSOM RACES,** the Derby, 65; the Oaks, 67.
- ESTIMATES, Navy and Army, Civil Service,** [111].
- EXCHEQUER BALANCES,** 249.
- EXCHEQUER, CHANCELLOR OF, Mr. Ward** Hunt appointed. [9]; Mr. Lowe appointed, [176].
- EXCHEQUER, COURT OF, Anthony Cleasby** appointed Baron, 252.
- EXCHEQUER, Treasurer of, Commissioners** appointed for executing office of, 250, 254.
- EXECUTION** of a Woman at Maidstone, 31; of the Todmorden murderer, the Droydsden murderer, and another, 32; of Mapp at Shrewsbury, 35; of Michael Barrett (the last public execution in England), 63; at Maidstone (the first private execution under the new Act), 101; at Newgate (the first in private), 119; of a woman at Lincoln, 156.
- EXHIBITIONS.**—National Portrait, [308]; Royal Academy, [315]; the Society of Painters in Water Colours, [318]; Institute of Painters in Water Colours, [319]; General Exhibition of Water-Colour Drawings, [319]; the French Gallery, [320]; the Winter Exhibition, [*ib.*]; the Architectural Exhibition, [321]; Great Exhibition at Leeds, [*ib.*]
- EXPORTS** during 1868, [186].
- "EXPLOSIVE BULLET TREATY,"** signed at St. Petersburg, [230].
- EXPLOSION** at Moxley Iron and Steel Works, 123; at the Green Pit, Ruabon, 128; at a Firework Manufactory in Barnsley, 130; of a boiler in Waterloo-road, 136; at Spring's Colliery, Hindley-common, near Wigan, 148; at Haydock Colliery, 158.
- "EXTINCTEUR,"** Experiments with the, on the Thames Embankment, 16.
- EYRE, EX-GOVERNOR,** Prosecution at Bow-street Police Court, 19; Charge of Mr. Justice Blackburn on case before Queen's Bench, 206.

- FAIRBAIRN, ANDREW**, Mayor of Leeds, knighted, 252.
- FENIAN ALARMS**, swearing-in of special constables, 1.
- FENIANISM**, statistics of, in Lord Mayo's speech, [5].
- FENIANS**.—Capture of Barrett, 2; Capture of Clancy, 3; Daring proclamation in front of Mansion-house, 3; Arrests and outrages at Cork, 9; Outrage in Cork, 13; Prisoners (Clerkenwell explosion) committed for trial, 19; Captain Muckay sentenced, 30; Michael Barrett executed, 63; narrative of trial of Barrett and others, 174.
- FEVERSHAM, LORD**, created Viscount Helmsley, 252.
- FIELD, CYRUS**, Banquet to, 81.
- FINANCIAL STATEMENT**, Mr. Ward Hunt's, [108]; Mr. Gladstone's general assent [110]; Resolutions agreed to, [111].
- FIRES**.—At the Oxford Music Hall, London, 12; at Eastwell Park, 30; at Northumberland House, Strand, 105; at the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company's premises at Southampton, 115; at the Stoke-on-Trent Railway Station, 137.
- FLOGGING IN THE ARMY**, Mr. Otway's motion to abolish it in time of peace carried, [121]; provision extended to marines on shore, [*ib.*]; passed after discussion in House of Lords, [*ib.*].
- FOREIGN HISTORY**, 189.
- FORGERY**, extraordinary charge of, 142.
- FORSTER, W. E.**, a Privy Councillor, 253; Vice-President of Committee of Council on Education, 254.
- FORTESCUE, MR. CHICHESTER**, Secretary for Ireland, [176].
- FRANCE**, political state of, [189]; the Budget, [193]; Army Organization Bill, [194]; Bill relating to the Liberty of the Press, [199]; the right of holding public meetings, [203]; pamphlet on policy of Second Empire, [204]; discussion on free trade, [205]; Emperor's speech at Rouen, [206]; discussion on Budget, [206]; new political map of France, [209]; the Baudin subscription, [210]; changes in Ministry, [211].
- GALES**.—At Edinburgh, 5, and generally throughout Great Britain, *ib.*; at London 8; on the coast, 111; off the Land's End, 134; throughout the kingdom, 150.
- GERMAN (NORTH) CONFEDERATION**, Lord A. W. F. S. Loftus appointed Ambassador, 250.
- GIBBALTAH**, Hon. and Ven. Archdeacon C. A. Harris appointed Bishop, 251.
- GIFFARD, GEORGE MARKHAM**, to be a Vice Chancellor, 250; knighted, 251.
- GLADSTONE, MR.**, at Romsey, 93; speech announcing the necessity for the disconnection of the Protestant Church of Ireland from the State, [56]; lays on the table of the House three resolutions on the subject, [60]; moves the first resolution, [79]; carried by a majority of 65, [83]; introduces Church-rate Abolition Bill, [147]; defeat in South-West Lancashire, [171]; Returned for Greenwich, [172]; on resignation of Mr. Disraeli, is commanded by the Queen to form an administration, [176]; First Lord of the Treasury, [*ib.*]; speech at Greenwich on his re-election, [180].
- GLASGOW**, visit of Prince and Princess of Wales, 131.
- GLASGOW UNIVERSITY**, laying of Foundation Stone of new buildings by the Prince of Wales, 132.
- GLYN, MR. GEORGE**, becomes one of the Secretaries of the Treasury, [177].
- GORMANSTON, VISCOUNT**, created a Baron of the United Kingdom, 253.
- GOSCHEN, MR.**, becomes President of the Poor Law Board, [177]; Poor Law Commissioner for England, 254.
- GRANT, GENERAL**, elected President of the United States, [264].
- GRANT, MAJOR J. A.**, Companion of the Star of India, 252.
- GRANVILLE, EARL**, and the principal members of the Opposition party left the House of Lords during discussion on Boundary Bill, *vide* BOUNDARY BILL, [36]; becomes Secretary for the Colonies, [176].
- GREECE**, connivance with revolution in Crete, [232]; *ultimatum* of Turkish Government, [*ib.*]; diplomatic relations broken off, [*ib.*]; conference proposed by France, [*ib.*].
- GREEN PIT**, Explosion at the, 128.
- GREGORY, REV. ROBERT**, Canon of St. Paul's, 253.
- GUILDHALL**, Presentation of the Lancashire Cotton Famine Memorial Window in, [91].
- GUY, MAJOR-GENERAL P. M. NELSON**, Lieutenant-Governor of Jersey, 252.
- HABEAS CORPUS ACT**, Renewal of Suspension in Ireland, [4].
- HADDINGTON, EARL OF**, appointed her Majesty's Commissioner to General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 251.
- HANDEL TRIENNIAL FESTIVAL** at Crystal Palace, 72.

HANNEN, JAMES, Justice of Queen's Bench, 250; knighted, 251.

HARRIS, HON. AND VEN. ARCHDEACON, C. A., appointed Bishop of Gibraltar, 251.

HARTINGTON, LORD, becomes Postmaster-General, [176].

HARVEY, R. B., created a baronet, 252.

HARVEY, R. J. H., created a baronet, 253.

HATHERLEY, LORD, becomes Lord-Chancellor, [176].

HAY, CAPTAIN LORD JOHN, becomes one of the Junior Lords of the Admiralty, [177].

HAYDOCK, Colliery Explosion, 156.

HAYES, GEORGE, Justice of Queen's Bench, 252; knighted, 254.

HEAD, SIR EDMUND, Obituary Notice of, 168.

HERCULES, Launch of the, 9.

HISTORY, Works connected with or relating to, [280]; smaller works on same subject, [298].

HOLLAND, THE QUEEN OF, arrival of at Torquay, 134.

HOOKE, (DR.), Address at opening of British Association at Norwich, 105.

HOME, DANIEL DOUGLAS, *Lyon versus*, Report of Trial, 187.

HORSE SHOW at Islington, 69.

HULL, Fatal disaster at, 122.

HUNT, MR. WARD, becomes Chancellor of Exchequer, [9]; introduces Budget, [108].

HURRICANE IN THE ISLE OF MAURITIUS, 24.

IMPORTS, [186].

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE of the Year, 248.

INDIA, British Rule in, discussion in House of Commons introduced by Lord William Hay, [135].

INDIA, COUNCIL OF, Lieut.-Col. Sir H. C. Rawlinson appointed member of, 252.

INTERNATIONAL YACHT RACE, 112.

IRELAND, Condition of, [2]; Lord Stanley's speech at Bristol, [3]; renewal of suspension of Habeas Corpus Act, [4]; discussion in House of Lords, [6]; Church Question, raised in House of Lords in discussion on Habeas Corpus Suspension Act [7]; The Affairs of Ireland the prominent topic of the Session, [44]; Bills on the subject of Land Tenure introduced by Mr. Pim and the Marquis of Clanricarde, [45]; Mr. Pim's abandoned, [ib.]; the Marquis of Clanricarde's referred to a Select Committee, [ib.]; Ecclesiastical

Titles Act of 1850, Earl Stanhope's motion for Select Committee, [46]; their appointment and report, [ib.]; Mr. Maguire's motion as to the state of Ireland, [ib.]; discussion, [48]; Earl Mayo's speech, [ib.]; debate adjourned, [50]; Mr. Horsman's speech, [ib.]; Mr. Lowe's, [51]; Mr. Mill's, [52]; Mr. Hardy's, [ib.]; Mr. Fortescue's, [53]; Mr. Newdegate's, [54]; Mr. Bright's, [ib.]; Sir Stafford Northcote's, [56]; Mr. Monsell's, [ib.]; Mr. Gladstone's, in which he declares the necessity for the disconnection of the Church of Ireland from the State, [ib.]; Mr. Disraeli's, [58]; Mr. Maguire's motion withdrawn, [59]; Mr. Gladstone's three resolutions laid before the House, [60]; notice of amendment by Lord Stanley, [ib.]; debate commenced, [ib.]; by Mr. Gladstone, [ib.]; Lord Stanley's speech, [63]; Lord Cranbourne's speech, [64]; division, with majority against the Government of 60, [72]; division on going into Committee of 56, [ib.]; public meetings in St. James's Hall, [73]; debate in House of Lords originated by Lord Derby, [78]; Mr. Gladstone moves his first resolution, and debate thereon, [79]; division, with majority of 65, [83]; adjournment of House to consider Ministerial position, [84]; Mr. Disraeli's statement, [84]; discussion thereon, [85]; public meeting in St. James's Hall, [89]; Mr. Gladstone's second resolution moved in Committee, [90]; carried, [91]; third resolution, [ib.]; and agreed to, [ib.]; address presented to her Majesty, and reply thereto, [93]; Suspensory Bill introduced, [94]; second reading carried by a majority of 54, [96]; and passed, [97]; debate in the House of Lords on second reading [ib.]; negatived by a majority of 95, [106].

IRELAND, Reform Bill introduced, [24]; read a second time, [25]; Mr. Fortescue's motion as to Universities negatived, [26]; Sir Colman O'Loughlen's motion to abolish right of voting by freemen negatived [ib.]; Col. French's motion to reduce the county franchise to 8*l.* negatived, [27]; Sir John Gray's motion for the ballot rejected, [ib.]; read a third time, [29]; in the House of Lords accepted, but with expressions of dissatisfaction, and passed, [30].

IRISH ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN, 11.

ITALY, History for the Year, [211].

JENNER, WILLIAM, M.D., created a baronet, 250.

- JERSEY**, Major-General P. M. Nelson Guy appointed Lieutenant-Governor, 252.
- JOCKLYN**, HON. W. N., Secretary to Legation at Stockholm, 252.
- JOHNSON**, MR. REVERDY, at Sheffield, 114; at Lord Mayor's banquet in Guildhall, 145.
- KEAN**, MR. CHARLES, Obituary notice of, 169.
- KEBLE COLLEGE**, OXFORD, Foundation stone laid, 30.
- KEMPE**, REV. J. E., Chaplain in Ordinary to her Majesty, 250.
- KENNEDY**, SIR ARTHUR EDWARD, appointed Governor of the West Africa Settlements, 250.
- KERR**, CAPTAIN LORD F. H., Groom-in-Waiting to her Majesty, 250.
- KIMBERLEY**, LORD, becomes Lord Privy Seal, [176].
- KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN**, MR., becomes Under-Secretary for the Home Department, [179].
- KNOLLYS**, FRANCIS, Usher to her Majesty, 250.
- KNOX-GORE**, F. A., created a baronet, 253.
- LANCASHIRE COTTON FAMINE**, Memorial Window in Guildhall, Presentation of, 91.
- LANCASHIRE**, Religious Riots in, 55.
- LAND TENURE** in Ireland Bills, *vide* IRELAND.
- LAND TRANSFER ACT**, Commissioners appointed, 251.
- LAYARD**, MR., becomes Chief Commissioner of Works and Buildings, [177].
- LEEDS**, Opening of Art Treasures Exhibition, by the Prince of Wales, 61; mayor of, knighted, 252.
- LEIGHTON**, REV. F. K., to be Canon of Westminster, 253.
- LIBEL**, Action for, *Risk Allah v. "Daily Telegraph,"* 217.
- LICHFIELD**, Rev. Canon Champneys appointed Dean of, 253.
- LINCOLN**, Execution of a woman at, 156.
- LISBON**, William Doria to be Secretary to Legation at, 250.
- LITERARY FUND**, Annual dinner of, 53.
- LITERATURE**, Retrospect of, [280]; works on general, [294]; light, of the year, [305]; summary for year, [307].
- LIVERPOOL**, Fall of a warehouse at, 138.
- LOFTUS**, LORD A. W. F. S., Ambassador to North German Confederation, 250.
- LONDON**, Lord Mayor's Day, 144; munificent gift of Mr. Peabody to the poor of, 149.
- LONGFELLOW**, MR., at Cambridge, 74.
- LONGLEY**, DR., Archbishop of Canterbury, Obituary notice of, 165.
- LORDS' HOUSE OF**.—Interesting discussion on Habeas Corpus Suspension Act in Ireland, [6]; change of procedure—abandoning of voting by proxy, [14]; Earl Granville and the principal members of the Opposition left the House during discussion on Boundary Bill, [36] (*vide* BOUNDARY BILL); premature debate on Mr. Gladstone's resolutions on the Irish Church Question originated by Lord Derby, [76]; explanations as to Ministerial course, [84]; debate on Suspensory Bill, [97], and rejection by a majority of 95, [106].
- LOWE**, MR., becomes Chancellor of the Exchequer, [176].
- LOWTHER**, HENRY, Lord Lieutenant of Cumberland and Westmorland, 253.
- LUDWIG**, ex-King of Bavaria, death of, [330].
- LYON v. HOME** Trial, [187].
- M'GEE**, THOMAS D'ARCY, Assassination of, in Canada, 34.
- MACKONCHIE**, REV. A. H., Trial of Martin v.
- MCNEILE**, REV. HUGH, D.D., Dean of Ripon, 252.
- MAGDALA**, Capture of, [139].
- MAGUIRE'S**, MR., motion as to the state of Ireland discussed, [48]; withdrawn, [59], *vide* IRELAND.
- MANCHESTER**, Murphy riots at, 116; fatal panic at a music hall, 94.
- MANSEL**, REV. H. L., appointed Dean of St. Paul's, 253.
- MAROCCHETTI**, BARON, Sketch of his life, [329].
- MARLBOROUGH**, DUKE OF, a Knight of the Garter, 251.
- MAYNE**, SIR RICHARD, Obituary notice of, 170.
- MAYNOOTH COLLEGE**.—Various motions proposed in House of Commons during discussions on Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions as to grant, [91]; motion by Colonel Greville-Nugent carried, [97]; Suspensory Bill rejected by House of Lords, [107].
- MAYO**, LORD.—Speech introducing the suspension of Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland, [4]; introduces Reform Bill for Ireland, [24]; speech on Mr. Maguire's motion as to the state of Ireland, [48]; Viceroy of India, 254.
- MAURITIUS**, Hurricane in the Isle of, 24, [186].

- MEAT MARKET**, Opening of New, 147.
- MEDICAL ASSOCIATION**, BRITISH, Meeting at Oxford, 97.
- "MELBOURNE TELESCOPE, THE GREAT,"** [336].
- MEREWETHER, COL. W. L.**, Extra Knight Commander of Star of India, 252.
- MICHAEL, PRINCE**, Sovereign of Servia, assassinated, [231].
- MIDDLESEX**, Duke of Wellington appointed Lord-Lieutenant of county, 251.
- MIDDLETON, R. T. C.**, Secretary to Legation at Berne, 250.
- MILITARY ORGANIZATION**, Lord Elcho's motion for a Royal Commission, [117]; withdrawn, [118].
- MILITARY EDUCATION**, Commissioners appointed, 251.
- MILL, MR. J. S.**, Speech on Alabama Claims, [129]; defeat at General Election, [173].
- MILLS, CHARLES**, created a baronet, 252.
- MILLWALL**, opening of new Docks at, 28.
- MILMAN, DR.**, Obituary notice of, 170.
- MILTON, JOHN**, supposed discovery of an unpublished poem of, [307].
- MINISTERS AND CHIEF OFFICERS OF STATE**, 254.
- MINISTRY**.—Resignation of Lord Derby, and acceptance of premiership by Mr. Disraeli, [8]; other changes, [9]; retirement of Mr. Disraeli's Cabinet, [174]; Mr. Gladstone's succeeds, [176].
- MINORITY CLAUSE**, Operation of during elections, [172].
- MITFORD, ALGERNON BERTHAM**, to be Second Secretary in her Majesty's Diplomatic Service, 250.
- MONCIEFF, MR.**, becomes Lord Advocate for Scotland, [177].
- MONSELL, RIGHT HON. W.**, becomes Under-Secretary for the Colonies, [177].
- MONTPENSIER, DUKE AND DUCHESS DE**, exiled from Spain, [212].
- MOXLEY IRON WORKS**, Explosion at, 123.
- "MURDER**.—At Todmorden, 22; attempt on a policeman in Finsbury, 24; extraordinary attempt on a woman by two boys in the City, 50; (agrarian) in Tipperary, 101; (brutal) of a woman at Porthrydyfen, 133.
- MURPHY, MR.**, the notorious lecturer against Roman Catholics, 116.
- MUTINY BILL**.—Mr. Otway's amendment to abolish flogging in time of peace, [120]; carried, [121]; provision extended to Marine Mutiny Bill, [*ib.*]; discussion in House of Lords, and acceptance of amendment, [*ib.*].
- MURPHY, MR.**, motion to abolish flogging in the army carried, [121]; becomes Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, [121].
- OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE BOAT RACE**, 31.
- OXFORD MUSIC HALL, LONDON**, Fire at, 12.
- OXFORD, UNIVERSITY OF**, Mr. Bonamy Price elected Professor of Political
- both Houses of Parliament, [140]; raised to the peerage, [142]; appointed Commander-in-Chief of expedition to Abyssinia, [255]; address to the army, [244]; distributes prizes, National Rifle Association at Wimbledon, 89.
- NAPIER, LORD**, *vide* **SIR ROBERT NAPIER**.
- NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION**, Meeting at Wimbledon, 84.
- NARVAEZ, MARSHAL**, Death of, [212].
- NATURALIZATION AND ALLEGIANCE, LAWS OF**, Report of Royal Commissioners, 237.
- NAVY ESTIMATES** moved by Mr. Corry, [111]; remarks and amendment of Mr. Childers, [113]; supported by Mr. Gladstone and others, [*ib.*]; negatived, [*ib.*]; Col. Sykes' motion for reduction of wages vote, [*ib.*]; negatived, [*ib.*]; votes agreed to, [*ib.*].
- NORTH AMERICAN PROVINCES CONFEDERATION ACT OF 1867**.—Remonstrances by Province of Nova Scotia, [136]; address to the Queen, [137]; Commission of Inquiry moved in the House of Commons by Mr. Bright, [137]; discussion and rejection, [138]; Commission advocated in House of Lords by Lord Stratheden, [139]; Confederation defended by the Duke of Buckingham and Lord Carnarvon, [*ib.*].
- NORTHBROOK, LORD**, becomes Under-Secretary for War, [177].
- NORTHCOTE, SIR STAFFORD**, exhibits Indian Budget, [123].
- NORTHUMBERLAND HOUSE**, Fire at, 105.
- NORWICH, British Association at**, 103.
- NOVA SCOTIA**, *vide* **NORTH AMERICAN PROVINCES**.
- NOVELS of the Year**, [305].
- OAKS, THE**, won by Formosa, 67.
- OBITUARY OF EMINENT PERSONS** deceased in 1868, 159.
- O'FARRELL**, Attempt on the life of the Duke of Edinburgh at Sydney, [142]; his execution, [144]; also 25.
- O'HAGAN, MR. JUSTICE**, becomes Lord Chancellor of Ireland, [177].
- O'NEILL, REV. WILLIAM**, created Lord O'Neill, 251.
- OTWAY, MR.**, motion to abolish flogging in the army carried, [121]; becomes Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, [121].
- NAPIER, SIR ROBERT**, receives thanks of

- Economy, 8; Keble College foundation stone laid, 50; accidental deaths of two undergraduates, 60; visit of the Prince of Wales and Crown Prince of Denmark (who received the degree of D.C.L.), 74; meeting of the British Medical Association, 97; Rev. W. Bright appointed Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, 253; Honour Lists, 261.
- PAKENHAM, HON. F. J., Secretary to Legation at Stockholm, 250; Secretary to Legation at Brussels, 251.
- PAKINGTON, SIR JOHN, moves Army Estimates, [115].
- PALMERSTON, Memorial to Lord, at Romsey, 92.
- PARIS, HON. L. S. S. WEST, Secretary to Embassy at, 251.
- PARLIAMENT, SESSION OF 1867-68.—Re-assembles after Christmas recess, 13th Feb., [4]; changes in the Ministry, [8]; adjournment to complete arrangements, [*ib.*]; meets after Easter recess, [76]; prorogued, 169; dissolved by proclamation, [170].
- PARLIAMENT, SESSION OF 1868-69.—Summoned to meet on Dec. 10, [171]; opened by Commission, [178]; election of Speaker, [179]; swearing-in of members and issue of new writs, [189]; adjourned from Dec. 15 to 29th, [*ib.*]; again meets, [184]; swearing in of members of the Cabinet and others, [*ib.*]; adjourned to Feb. 16, 1869, [*ib.*].
- PEABODY, MR., munificent gift to the poor of London, 149.
- PEEL, MR. A. W., becomes Secretary to the Poor Law Board, [177].
- PINE, SIR B. C. C., Governor of Western Australia, 252.
- PRIM, GENERAL, on breaking out of the Revolution in Spain, leaves England, and arrives at Cadiz, [212]; proclamation at Cadiz, [*ib.*]; proclamation at Seville, [214].
- PRIVATE EXECUTION, first under the new Act in England, 63; first in Newgate, 119.
- POETRY of the Year, [307].
- PORTRHYDYFEN, brutal murder of a woman at, 134.
- PORTSMOUTH, Easter Monday Volunteer Review at, 35.
- PRICE, MR. BONAMY, Professor of Political Economy at Oxford, 8.
- PROMISSORY OATHS BILL, [166].
- PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS, 250.
- PROXY, Abandonment of voting in the House of Lords by, [16].
- PRUSSIA, CROWN PRINCESS OF, Arrival at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, 134.
- PRUSSIA, [218].—Speech of the King at opening of the Reichstag, [219]; royal speech at the Prorogation of the Prussian Chambers, [220]; opening of the Prussian Diet in November, [221].
- PUBLIC EXECUTIONS IN ENGLAND, Act passed for discontinuance of, [16]; the last in England, 63.
- PUBLIC SCHOOLS BILL, [166].
- PURCHASE-SYSTEM IN THE ARMY.—Resolutions moved by Mr. Trevelyan, [118]; discussion and amendment by Captain Vivian, [119]; motion and amendment withdrawn, [120].
- QUEEN, THE.—Address by Irish residents in London, 11; lays the first stone of the new St. Thomas's Hospital, 58; reviews the Volunteers at Windsor, 75; Departure for Switzerland, 97; return from Switzerland, 120; departure for Balmoral, 121; Mr. Disraeli details to House of Commons his interview with her Majesty after passing of Mr. Gladstone's 1st Resolution, [84]; much resentment expressed at the use of her Majesty's name, [87]; her Majesty's answer to address of the House, [93]; publishes "Leaves from the Journal of our Life in the Highlands," [294]; at the Prince Consort's mausoleum, 153; Captain Lord F. H. Kerr appointed Groom-in-Waiting, 250; Francis Knollys, Usher, *ib.*; Rev. J. E. Kempe, Chaplain in Ordinary, *ib.*; Hon. and Rev. G. T. O. Bridgman, Honorary Chaplain, *ib.*
- QUEEN'S BENCH.—James Hannen appointed Justice, 250; George Hayes appointed Justice, 252.
- QUEENSLAND, S. W. Blackall appointed Governor, 251.
- QUAIN, JOHN RICHARD, Attorney-General of Durham, 252.
- RAILWAY.—North British, accident near Arncliffe Collieries, 21; St. John's Wood, opening of, 39; London and North-Western; accident to Irish train near Abergele, 106; opening of the New Midland line between London and Bedford, 84; London and North-Western, accident near Birdingbury Station, on Leamington and Coventry Branch, 129; Opening of Metropolitan Western Extension, 130; Fire at the Stoke-on-Trent Station, 137; South Wales branch of Great Western, fatal accident near Bullo Pill, 140; dreadful accident on the Brighton line, 152.

- RAILWAY COMPANIES BILL**, [165].
- RAWLINSON, LIEUT.-COL. SIR H. C.**, to be a Member of the Council of India, 252.
- REFORM, PARLIAMENTARY.**—Bill for Scotland introduced, [19]; *vide* SCOTLAND; Bill for Ireland introduced, [24]; *vide* IRELAND.
- REGISTRY OF DEEDS FOR COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX**, Commissioners appointed, 251.
- REGISTRATION OF VOTERS' BILL** introduced, 43; read a second time and passed by both Houses, [*ib.*].
- REGIUM DONUM**, Mr. Aytoun's resolution, [91]; Mr. Gladstone declares it should be abolished, [92].
- RESOLUTIONS ON IRISH CHURCH QUESTION**, Mr. Gladstone's, [60]; *vide* IRELAND.
- RIOTS, Political**, at Blackburn, 135.
- RIPON, Rev. Hugh McNeile, D.D.**, appointed Dean, 252.
- RITUAL OBSERVANCES**, Bill for restraining, introduced by Lord Shaftesbury, [163]; previous question moved, negatived, and Bill withdrawn, [*ib.*].
- RITUALISM.**—Trial, *Martin v. Mackonochie*, 226.
- ROBINSON, VICE-ADMIRAL SIR R. S.**, becomes one of the Junior Lords of the Admiralty, [177].
- ROCHDALE**, Falling in of a house at, 155.
- ROMSEY**, Memorial to Lord Palmerston at, 92.
- ROSSINI**, Obituary notice of, 171.
- ROUEN**, Speech of the Emperor at, 206.
- ROYAL ACADEMY**, Annual dinner of, 51; Exhibition, [315]; meets for first time in new rooms in Burlington House, [330].
- RUABON**, Explosion at the Green Pit, near, 128.
- RUMBOLD, HORACE**, Secretary to Embassy at St. Petersburg, 250.
- RUSSELL MAJOR-GENERAL E. L.**, Knight Commander of Star of India, 252.
- SCIENCE, Retrospect of**, [331].
- SCLATIER-BOOTH, MR.**, succeeds Mr. Ward Hunt as Financial Secretary to the Treasury, [9].
- SCOTLAND.**—Reform Bill introduced, [19]; objections taken to redistribution of seats, [20]; read a second time [22]; discussions upon the proposition to increase the number of the House by the addition of seven members for Scotland, [21]; in committee Mr. Baxter's motion to disfranchise boroughs in England carried [23]; Mr. Bouverie's motion to get rid of rate-paying qualifications carried, [*ib.*]; Mr. Bouverie's amendment acquiesced in by the Government, [23]; after counter propositions and discussions Mr. Baxter's amendment acquiesced in also, [24]; no further opposition in subsequent stages or in House of Lords, [*ib.*].
- SCOTLAND, Peers elected to Parliament**, 253.
- SCOTLAND, GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE CHURCH OF**, the Earl of Haddington appointed her Majesty's Commissioner, 251.
- SCULLY, MR. WILLIAM**, murdered in Tipperary, 101.
- SEELY, MR.**, moves for a Select Committee on Admiralty accounts, [113].
- SELWYN, SIR C. J.**, appointed Judge of Appeal in Chancery, 250; a Privy Councillor, 251.
- SERRANO, MARSHAL**, exiled, [212]; places himself at the head of the revolutionary movement, [213]; returns to Spain, and entry into Madrid, [215].
- SERVIA.**—Assassination of Prince Michael, [231]; Prince Milan elected his successor, [*ib.*]; conviction of murderers of Prince Michael, [232].
- SEYMER, H. E. C. K.**, Secretary of Legation at Berne, 252.
- SHAW-LEFEVRE, MR. G.**, becomes Secretary to the Board of Trade, [177].
- SHEE, MR. JUSTICE**, Obituary notice of, 171.
- SHEFFIELD**, the United States' Minister at the annual feast of the Cutlers' Company at, 114.
- SHERIFFS, HIGH**, for England, 260; for Wales, 261.
- SLADE'S, MR. FELIX**, Bequest, [323]; description of collection, [326].
- SMITH, CHARLES THOMAS**, Puisne Judge at Cape of Good Hope, 254.
- SMITHFIELD**, Opening of New Meat Market at, 147.
- SMITHFIELD CLUB CATTLE SHOW**, 151.
- SNAGG, SIR W.**, Chief Justice of British Guiana, 254.
- SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION**, Annual Congress at Birmingham, 124.
- SOUTHAMPTON DOCKS**, Fire in, 115.
- ST. HELENA**, Joseph Stone Williams appointed Chief Justice of, 252.
- ST. LEONARD'S-ON-SEA**, Arrival of Crown Princess of Prussia at, 134.
- ST. PAUL'S**, Rev. R. Gregory appointed a Canon, 253; Rev. H. L. Mansel appointed Dean, *ib.*
- ST. PETERSBURG**, Horace Rumbold, Secretary to Embassy at, 250.
- ST. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL**, First Stone of the new buildings laid by the Queen, 58.
- SCHOOL INQUIRY COMMISSION**, Papers, [295].

- SPAIN.**—Review of history for year, [211]; exile of the generals, [212]; exile of the Duke and Duchess de Montpensier, [*ib.*]; outbreak of the revolution at Cadiz, [*ib.*]; return of the banished generals, [*ib.*]; proclamation of General Prim, [*ib.*]; resignation of the ministry, [213]; defeat of the royal troops [214]; flight of the Queen, [*ib.*]; manifesto of provisional government, [*ib.*]; formation of provisional ministry, [215]; protest by the Queen, [*ib.*]; recognition of provisional government by Foreign Powers, [216].
- SPEKE, REV. B.**, his mysterious disappearance and recovery, 17.
- SPENCER, EARL**, becomes Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, [177]; arrives at Dublin, 154.
- STALYBRIDGE**, Religious riot at, 57.
- STANLEY, LORD**, Speech at Bristol, [2]; speech on the "Alabama" claims, [127].
- STANSFELD, MR.**, becomes Third Lord of the Treasury, [177].
- STATE, HER MAJESTY'S MINISTERS AND CHIEF OFFICERS OF**, 254.
- STATE PAPERS, PUBLIC DOCUMENTS AND**, 237.
- STOCKHOLM.**—Hon. F. J. Pakenham, to be Secretary to Legation at, 250; Hon. W. N. Jocelyn, to be Secretary to Legation at, 252.
- STRIKE AMONG THE LONDON CABMEN**, 118.
- STUART, HON. WM.**, appointed Minister to Argentine Republic, 250.
- SULLIVAN, MR. E.**, becomes Attorney-General for Ireland, [177].
- SUN**, Eclipse of the, [331].
- SUSPENSORY BILL.**—Irish Church Benefices, [94]; rejected by House of Lords, [106]; *vide* IRELAND.
- SYDNEY, VISCOUNT**, becomes Lord Chamberlain, [177].
- TAIT, DR.**, Bishop of London, appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, 253.
- TECK, PRINCE AND PRINCESS**, Birth of a son, 101; christening, 130.
- TELEGRAPH PURCHASE BILL**, [166].
- TELESCOPE**, Great Melbourne, [336].
- THAMES EMBANKMENT**, Opening of the, 93.
- THEODORE, KING**, Death of, [139].
- TILSON, THOMAS**, Knighted, 251.
- TIPPERARY**, Agrarian murders in, 101.
- TODMORDEN**, Shocking murders at, 22; execution of the murderer, 32.
- TOPPETE, ADMIRAL**, and the Spanish fleet under his command, declares for revolution, [212].
- TORQUAY**, Arrival of the Queen of Holland at, 134.
- TRAVELS**, Books of, [804].
- TREASURER OF EXCHEQUER**, Mr. Disraeli and others appointed Commissioners for executing office of, 250; Mr. Gladstone and others appointed, 254.
- TREVELYAN, MR. G. O.**, moves resolutions on purchase system in army, [118]; becomes one of the Junior Lords of the Admiralty, [177].
- TRIALS**, Remarkable, 174.
- TROLLOPE, SIR JOHN**, created Lord Kes-teen, 251.
- TURKEY**, Ultimatum to Greece in reference to insurrection in Crete, and breaking off of diplomatic relations, [232].
- UNITED STATES.**—History for the year, [246]; Bill for protection of naturalized citizens, [*ib.*]; impeachment of the President, [250]; acquittal, [253]; manifesto of Republican party, [*ib.*]; Arkansas readmitted to Union, [255]; financial statement for year, [256]; amnesty to rebels, [257]; "platform of democratic party, [*ib.*]; Bill to prevent Southern States voting passed, [*ib.*]; contest for the Presidency, [263]; General Grant elected, [264]; President Johnson's annual Message, [266].
- UNITED STATES' MINISTER**, Mr. Reverdy Johnson, at Sheffield, 114; at Guildhall, 145.
- UNIVERSITY HONOURS**, 261.
- UNIVERSITY TESTS ABOLITION BILL**, introduced by Mr. J. D. Coleridge, [160]; second reading carried, [163]; further progress stopped by pressure of business, [*ib.*].
- VIVIAN, CAPTAIN**, moves amendment on purchase system in army [119]; becomes one of the Lords of the Treasury, [177].
- VESUVIUS**, Eruptions of, [186].
- VOLUNTEERS.**—Distribution of prizes to London Scottish, 6; Easter Monday review at Portsmouth, 35; review of Inns of Court and University, at Wimbledon, 40; royal review at Windsor, 75; review at Wimbledon, 90; capitulation vote—attempt for increase, [117].
- WALES, PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF.**—Visit to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, 14; visit to Ireland, 40; visit to the horse show, 70; at Ascot races, 71; birth of a daughter, 83; christening of

- Princess Victoria, 99; visit to Glasgow, 181; departure for the Continent, 147.
- WALES, THE PRINCE OF.—President at anniversary dinner of Benevolent Society of St. Patrick, 29; installation as Knight of St. Patrick at Dublin, 45; speech at annual dinner of Royal Academy, 51; President at annual inspection of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, and annual dinner, 60; visits Leeds, and opens Art Treasures Exhibition, 61; at Oxford, 74; at the royal volunteer review at Windsor, 78; at the festival at Crystal Palace to welcome the Duke of Edinburgh, 81; at the volunteer review at Wimbledon, 90; lays foundation stone of Glasgow University, 181; Colonel-in-Chief of the Rifle Brigade, 252.
- WALKER, JAMES, created a baronet, 253.
- WALPOLE, MR., resigns his seat in the Cabinet [9]; brings up Report of Select Committee on Boundaries of Boroughs Bill, [33].
- WALSH, SIR JOHN BENN, created Lord Ormathwaite, 251.
- WATKIN, EDWARD W., knighted, 252.
- WELLINGTON, DUKE OF, appointed Lord Lieutenant of County of Middlesex, 251.
- WENSLEYDALE, LORD, Obituary notice of, 172.
- WEST, HON. L. S. S., Secretary to Embassy at Paris, 251.
- WEST INDIES, Bill for Disendowment of Church in, brought in by Government, [163]; and after discussion carried, [165].
- WESTMINSTER, Rev. W. E. Leighton, to be Canon of, 253.
- WESTMORLAND, CUMBERLAND AND, Henry Lowther appointed Lord Lieutenant, 253.
- WHEATSTONE, CHARLES, knighted, 250.
- WIGAN, Colliery Explosion near, 148.
- WILLIAMS, JOSEPH STONE, Chief Justice of St. Helena, 252.
- WINDSOR, Royal Volunteer Review at, 75.
- WIMBLEDON, Meeting of the National Rifle Association at, 84; review of Volunteers at, 90.
- WRECKS, upon the Gower Coast, 4.
- WOOD, VICE-CHANCELLOR SIR WILLIAM PAGE, to be a Judge of Appeal in Chancery, 250; a Privy Councillor, 251; Lord Chancellor, 253; created Lord Hatherley, *ib.*
- YACHT RACE, International, 112.
- YEAR, Review of the, [184].
- YOUNG, MR. G., becomes Solicitor-General for Scotland, [177].
- YOUNG, SIR JOHN, Knight Grand Cross of the Bath, 253.

THE END.

April, 1869.

New Works

in Course of Publication

by

MESSRS. RIVINGTON,

WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON;

HIGH STREET, OXFORD; TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE.

THE REFORMATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ; its History, Principles, and Results. A.D. 1514—1547.

By **John Henry Blunt, M.A.**, Vicar of Kennington, Oxford,
Editor of "The Annotated Book of Common Prayer," Author
of "Directorium Pastorale," &c., &c.

8vo. 16s.

**NEWMAN'S (J. H.) PAROCHIAL AND PLAIN
Sermons.**

Edited by the Rev. **W. J. Copeland**, Rector of Farnham,
Essex. From the Text of the last Editions published by
Messrs. Rivington.

Complete in 8 vols. . Crown 8vo. 5s. each.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

Messrs. Rivington's New Publications

THE WITNESS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT TO
Christ. The Boyle Lectures for the Year 1868.

By the Rev. **Stanley Leathes**, M.A., Preacher at St. James's,
Westminster, and Professor of Hebrew in King's College,
London.

8vo. 9s.

THE DIVINITY OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR
Jesus Christ; being the Bampton Lectures for 1866.

By **Henry Parry Liddon**, M.A., Student of Christ Church
and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Salisbury.

Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.

SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY
of Oxford.

By **Henry Parry Liddon**, M.A., Student of Christ Church,
and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Salisbury.

Third Edition, revised. Crown 8vo. 5s.

PREPARATION FOR DEATH.

Translated from the Italian of Alfonso, Bishop of S. Agatha.
Forming the Advent Volume of the "Ascetic Library," a Series
of Translations of Spiritual Works for Devotional Reading from
Catholic Sources. Edited by the Rev. **Orby Shipley**, M.A.

Square crown 8vo. 5s.

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

In Eight Sermons, preached in Westminster Abbey.

By **Chr. Wordsworth**, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln; formerly
Canon of Westminster, and Archdeacon.

Crown 8vo. 6s.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

Messrs. Rivington's New Publications

THE VIRGIN'S LAMP:

Prayers and Devout Exercises for English Sisters, chiefly composed and selected by the late Rev. **J. M. Neale, D.D.**, Founder of St. Margaret's, East Grinstead.

Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE SWORD AND THE KEYS.

The Civil Power in its Relations to The Church; considered with Special Reference to the Court of Final Ecclesiastical Appeal in England. With Appendix containing all Statutes on which the jurisdiction of that Tribunal over Spiritual Causes is Founded, and also, all Ecclesiastical Judgments delivered by it since those published by the Lord Bishop of London in 1865.

By **James Wayland Joyce, M.A.**, Rector of Burford, Salop.

8vo. 10s. 6d.

SPIRITUAL LIFE.

By **John James, D.D.**, late Canon of Peterborough, Author of "A Comment on the Collects of the Church of England," &c.

12mo. 5s.

BIBLE READINGS FOR FAMILY PRAYER.

By the Rev. **W. H. Ridley, M.A.**, Rector of Hambleton.

Old Testament—Genesis and Exodus.

New Testament—St. Luke and St. John.

Crown 8vo. 2s. each.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

as stated in Ecclesiastical Documents set forth by Authority of Church and State, in the Reformation Period between 1536 and 1662.

Edited by the Rev. **John Henry Blunt.**

8vo. 7s. 6d.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

SELECTIONS FROM MODERN FRENCH AUTHORS.

With English Notes.

By **Henri Van Laun**, French Master at Cheltenham College.

Part I.—HONORÉ DE BALZAC.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

MISCELLANEOUS POEMS.

By **Henry Francis Lyte**, M.A.*New Edition.* Small 8vo. 5s.A KEY TO THE KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF
the Holy Bible.By **John Henry Blunt**, M.A.

Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

VOX ECCLESIAE ANGLICANÆ: ON THE CHURCH

Ministry and Sacraments. A Selection of Passages from the Writings of the Chief Divines of the Church of England. With short Introductions and Notices of the Writers.

By **George G. Perry**, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln, Rector of Waddington, Rural Dean, and Proctor for the Diocese of Lincoln.

Crown 8vo. 6s.

ENGLAND VERSUS ROME: A BRIEF HAND-
book of the Roman Catholic Controversy, for the use of
Members of the English Church.By **Henry Barclay Swete**, M.A., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

16mo. 2s. 6d.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

Messrs. Rivington's New Publications

LIBER PRECUM PUBLICARUM ECCLESIAE AN-
glicanae.

A **Gulielmo Bright, A.M.**, et **Petro Goldsmith Medd, A.M.**,
Presbyteris, Collegii Universitatis in Acad. Oxon. Sociis, Latine
redditus.

In an elegant pocket volume, with all the Rubrics in red.

New Edition. Small 8vo. 6s.

SKETCHES OF THE RITES AND CUSTOMS OF
the Greco-Russian Church.

By **H. C. Romanoff**. With an Introductory Notice by the
Author of "The Heir of Redclyffe."

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ANNALS OF THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY, OXFORD ;
from its Foundation to A.D. 1867 ; containing an Account of
the various collections of printed books and MSS. there pre-
served ; with a brief Preliminary Sketch of the earlier Library
of the University.

By **W. D. Macray, M.A.**, Assistant in the Library, Chaplain
of Magdalen and New Colleges.

8vo. 12s.

A KEY TO THE KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF
the Book of Common Prayer.

By **John Henry Blunt, M.A.**

Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE MYSTERIES OF MOUNT CALVARY.

By **Antonio de Guevara**.

Being the First Volume of the "Ascetic Library," a Series of
Translations of Spiritual Works for Devotional Reading from
Catholic Sources. Edited by the Rev. **Orby Shipley, M.A.**

Square crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Messrs. Rivington's New Publications

VESTIARIUM CHRISTIANVM: THE ORIGIN AND

Gradual Development of the Dress of the Holy Ministry in the Church, as evidenced by Monuments both of Literature and of Art, from the Apostolic Age to the present time.

By the Rev. **Wharton B. Marriott**, M.A., F.S.A. (sometime Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and Assistant-Master at Eton), Select Preacher in the University, and Preacher, by licence from the Bishop, in the Diocese of Oxford.

Royal 8vo. 38s.

THE ANNOTATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER;

being an Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England.

Edited by **John Henry Blunt**, M.A.

Third Edition. Imperial 8vo. 36s.

Large paper Edition. Royal 4to. 3*l.* 3s.

THE PRAYER BOOK INTERLEAVED;

with Historical Illustrations and Explanatory Notes arranged parallel to the Text, by the Rev. **W. M. Campion**, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Queens' College and Rector of St. Botolph's, and the Rev. **W. J. Beaumont**, M.A., late Senior Fellow of Trinity College, and Incumbent of St. Michael's, Cambridge. With a Preface by the **Lord Bishop of Ely**.

Fourth Edition. Small 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

FLOWERS AND FESTIVALS; OR, DIRECTIONS

for the Floral Decorations of Churches. With coloured Illustrations.

By **W. A. Barrett**, of S. Paul's Cathedral, late Clerk of Magdalen College, and Commoner of S. Mary Hall, Oxford.

Square crown 8vo. 5s.

Messrs. Rivington's New Publications

SERMONS FOR CHILDREN:

Being Twenty-eight Short Readings, addressed to the Children of St. Margaret's Home, East Grinstead.

By the late Rev. **J. M. Neale**, D.D., Warden of Sackville College.

• *Second Edition.* Small 8vo. (*In the press.*)

CURIOUS MYTHS OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

By **S. Baring-Gould**, M.A., Author of "Post-Medieval Preachers," &c. With Illustrations.

First and Second Series. *New Edition.* Complete in one Volume.

Crown 8vo. 6s.

HOUSEHOLD THEOLOGY: A HANDBOOK OF

Religious Information respecting the Holy Bible, the Prayer Book, the Church, the Ministry, Divine Worship, the Creeds, &c., &c.

By **J. H. Blunt**, M.A.

Third Edition. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

YESTERDAY, TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER: A POEM

in Twelve Books.

By **Edward Henry Bickersteth**, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon.

" *Third Edition.* Small 8vo. 6s.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

THE HILLFORD CONFIRMATION: A TALE.By **M. C. Phillpotts.**

18mo. 1s.

THE SACRAMENTS AND SACRAMENTAL ORDINANCES of the Church ; being a Plain Exposition of their History, Meaning, and Effects.By **John Henry Blunt, M.A.**

Small 8vo. 4s. 6d.

SOIMÊME : A STORY OF A WILFUL LIFE.

Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS.By the Rev. **E. B. Pusey, D.D.**, Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

2 vols., 8vo. 6s. each.

CATECHESIS; OR, CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTION PREPARATORY to Confirmation and First Communion.By **Charles Wordsworth, D.C.L.**, Bishop of St. Andrews.*New and Cheaper Edition.* Small 8vo. 2s.**THE ANNUAL REGISTER: A REVIEW OF PUBLIC Events at Home and Abroad, for the Year 1868 ; being the Sixth Volume of an Improved Series.**8vo. (*Nearly ready.*)* * * *The Volumes for 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, and 1867 may be had, price 18s. each.*

THOMAS A KEMPIS, OF THE IMITATION OF
Christ: a carefully revised Translation, elegantly printed with
red borders.

16mo. 2s. 6d.

Also a cheap Edition, without the red borders, 1s., or in Wrapper, 6d.

THE RULE AND EXERCISES OF HOLY LIVING.

By **Jeremy Taylor**, D.D., Bishop of Down, Connor, and
Dromore.

A New Edition, elegantly printed with red borders.

16mo. 2s. 6d.

Also a cheap Edition, without the red borders, 1s.

THE RULE AND EXERCISES OF HOLY DYING.

By **Jeremy Taylor**, D.D., Bishop of Down, Connor, and
Dromore.

A New Edition, elegantly printed with red borders.

16mo. 2s. 6d.

Also a cheap Edition, without the red borders, 1s.

* * * The "Holy Living" and "Holy Dying" may be had
bound together in one Volume, 5s.

A SHORT AND PLAIN INSTRUCTION FOR THE
better Understanding of the Lord's Supper; to which is an-
nexed, the Office of the Holy Communion, with proper Helps
and Directions.

By **Thomas Wilson**, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Sodor and
Man.

*New and complete Edition, elegantly printed with rubrics and
borders in red. 16mo. (Nearly ready.)*

INTRODUCTION TO THE DEVOUT LIFE.

From the French of Saint Francis of Sales, Bishop and Prince
of Geneva.

A New Translation.

16mo. (*In the Press.*)

DEAN ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT.

With English Notes, intended for the Upper Forms of Schools, and for Pass-men at the Universities. Abridged by **Bradley H. Alford**, M.A., Vicar of Leavenheath, Colchester; late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THOUGHTS ON PERSONAL RELIGION; BEING. A
Treatise on the Christian Life in its Two Chief Elements,
Devotion and Practice.

By **Edward Meyrick Goulburn**, D.D., Dean of Norwich.

New Edition. Small 8vo. 6s. 6d.

An edition for presentation, Two Volumes, small 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Also, a Cheap Edition. 3s. 6d.

SIX SHORT SERMONS ON SIN. LENT LECTURES

at S. Alban the Martyr, Holborn.

By the Rev. **Orby Shipley**, M.A.

Fourth Edition. Small 8vo. 1s.

OCCASIONAL SERMONS.

By **H. P. Liddon**, M.A., Student of Christ Church, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Salisbury.

Crown 8vo. (*In preparation.*)

A FOURTH SERIES OF PAROCHIAL SERMONS,
preached in a Village Church.

By the Rev. **Charles A. Heurtley**, D.D., Rector of Fenny Compton, Warwickshire, Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

12mo. 5s. 6d.

POPULAR OBJECTIONS TO THE BOOK OF
Common Prayer considered, in Four Sermons on the Sunday
Lessons in Lent, the Communion Service, and the Athanasian
Creed, with a Preface on the existing Lectionary.

By **Edward Meyrick Goulburn**, D.D., Dean of Norwich.

Second Edition. Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

SICKNESS; ITS TRIALS AND BLESSINGS.

Fine Edition. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Also, a Cheap Edition, 1s. 6d., or in Paper Wrapper, 1s.

DEVOTIONAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL
according to S. Matthew.

Translated from **Pasquier Quemel**.

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

FLOSCULI CHELTONIENSES: A SELECTION FROM
the Cheltenham College Prize Poems, 1846—1866.

Edited by **C. S. Jerram**, M.A., Trinity College, Oxford, and
Theodore W. James, M.A., Pembroke College, Oxford.

Crown 8vo. 9s.

THE DOGMATIC FAITH: AN INQUIRY INTO
the Relation subsisting between Revelation and Dogma.
Being the Bampton Lectures for 1867.

By **Edward Garbett**, M.A., Incumbent of Christ Church,
Surbiton.

Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.

THE LIFE OF MADAME LOUISE DE FRANCE,
Daughter of Louis XV. Known in Religion as the Reverend
Mother T  rese de S. Augustine.

By the Author of "Tales of Kirkbeck."

Small 8vo. (*In the press.*)

FAMILY PRAYERS: COMPILED FROM VARIOUS
Sources (chiefly from Bishop Hamilton's Manual), and arranged
on the Liturgical Principle.

By **Edward Meyrick Goulburn**, D.D., Dean of Norwich.

New Edition. Crown 8vo, large type, 3s. 6d.

Cheap Edition. 16mo, 1s.

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH OF THE EAST IN
The Eighteenth Century; being the Correspondence between
the Eastern Patriarchs and the Nonjuring Bishops. With an
Introduction on Various Projects of Reunion between the Eastern
Church and the Anglican Communion.

By **George Williams**, D.D., Senior Fellow of King's College,
Cambridge.

8vo. 7s. 6d.

CATECHETICAL NOTES AND CLASS QUESTIONS,
Literal and Mystical; chiefly on the Earlier Books of Holy
Scripture.

By the late Rev. **J. M. Neale**, D.D., Warden of Sackville
College, East Grinstead.

Crown 8vo. (*In the Press.*)

THE TREASURY OF DEVOTION: A MANUAL OF
Prayers for Daily Use.

Edited by the Rev. **T. T. Carter**, Rector of Clewer.

16mo. Limp Cloth, 2s. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

MISS LANGLEY'S WILL. A TALE.

2 Vols., post 8vo. £1 1s.

FIVE YEARS' CHURCH WORK IN THE KINGDOM
of Hawaii.

By the **Bishop of Honolulu.**

With Maps and Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 5s.

THE TRUE PASSOVER.

By **Thomas Parry, D.D.,** Bishop of Barbados.

Small 8vo. 1s. 6d.

COUNSELS UPON HOLINESS OF LIFE.

Translated from the Spanish of "The Sinner's Guide" by
Luis de Granada; forming a volume of the "Ascetic Library,"
a Series of Translations of Spiritual Works for Devotional
Reading from Catholic Sources.

Crown 8vo. (*In the press.*)

A GLOSSARY OF ECCLESIASTICAL TERMS;
containing Explanations of Terms used in Architecture, Eccle-
siology, Hymnology, Law, Ritualism, Theology, Heresies, and
Miscellaneous Subjects.

By Various Writers. Edited by the Rev. **Orby Shipley, M.A.**

8vo. (*In preparation.*)

REFLECTIONS ON THE REVOLUTION IN FRANCE

and on the Proceedings in certain Societies in London relative
to that Event. In a Letter intended to have been sent to a
Gentleman in Paris, 1790.

By the Right Hon. **Edmund Burke, M.P.**

New Edition. With a Short Biographical Notice. Crown 8vo.

3s. 6d.

SPIRITUAL COMMUNINGS.

By Sir **Archibald Edmonstone**, Bart.

Small 8vo. 2s.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION IN THE CHURCH
of England.By the Rev. **Arthur W. Haddan**, B.D., Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.8vo. (*In the Press.*)

THE HOLY BIBLE.

With Notes and Introductions.

By **Chr. Wordsworth**, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln; formerly Canon of Westminster, and Archdeacon.

Imperial 8vo.

		Part		£	s.	d.
Vol. I.	38s.	{	I. Genesis and Exodus. <i>Second Edit.</i>	1	1	0
			II. Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. <i>Second Edition</i>	0	18	0
Vol. II.	21s.	{	III. Joshua, Judges, Ruth. <i>Second Edit.</i>	0	12	0
			IV. The Books of Samuel. <i>Second Edit.</i>	0	10	0
Vol. III.	21s.	{	V. The Books of Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, <i>Second Edition</i>	1	1	0
			VI. The Book of Job. <i>Second Edition</i>	0	9	0
Vol. IV.	34s.	{	VII. The Book of Psalms. <i>Second Edit.</i>	0	15	0
			VIII. Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon	0	12	0
Vol. V.			IX. Isaiah	0	12	6

THE PRAYER BOOK AND ORDINAL OF 1549.

Edited by the Rev. **H. B. Walton**, Vicar of St. Cross, Holywell, Oxford, late Fellow and Tutor of Merton College. With Introduction by the Rev. **P. G. Medd**, senior Fellow and Tutor of University College.

Small 8vo. (*In the press.*)

PERRANZABULŌE, THE LOST CHURCH FOUND ;
or, The Church of England not a New Church, but Ancient, Apostolical, and Independent, and a Protesting Church Nine Hundred Years before the Reformation.

By the Rev. **C. T. Collins Trelawny**, M.A., formerly Rector of Timsbury, Somerset, and late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. With Illustrations.

New Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

FROM MORNING TO EVENING :

a Book for Invalids.

From the French of M. L'Abbé Henri Perreyve. Translated and adapted by an Associate of the Sisterhood of S. John Baptist, Clewer.

Crown 8vo. 5s.

THE NEW TESTAMENT FOR ENGLISH READERS ;
containing the Authorized Version, with a Revised English Text ; Marginal References ; and a Critical and Explanatory Commentary. By **Henry Alford**, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.

In 2 Vols. or 4 Parts, 8vo, price 54s. 6d.

Separately,

Vol. 1, Part I.—The three first Gospels, with a Map. *Second Edition.* 12s.

Vol. 1, Part II.—St. John and the Acts. *Second Edition.* 10s. 6d.

Vol. 2, Part I.—The Epistles of St. Paul, with a Map. *Second Edition.* 16s.

Vol. 2, Part II.—Hebrews to Revelation. 8vo. 16s.

EGYPT'S RECORD OF TIME TO THE EXODUS
of Israel; critically investigated : with a comparative Survey of the Patriarchal History and the Chronology of Scripture ; resulting in the Reconciliation of the Septuagint and Hebrew Computations, and Manetho with both.

By **W. B. Galloway**, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Regent's Park, and Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord Viscount Hawarden.

8vo. 15s.

CATENA CLASSICORUM,

A Series of Classical Authors,

EDITED BY MEMBERS OF BOTH UNIVERSITIES UNDER THE DIRECTION OF

THE REV. ARTHUR HOLMES, M.A.

FELLOW AND LECTURER OF CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, LECTURER AND LATE FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE; AND

THE REV. CHARLES BIGG, M.A.

LATE SENIOR STUDENT AND TUTOR OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD,
SECOND CLASSICAL MASTER OF CHELTENHAM COLLEGE.

*The following Parts have been
already published:—*

SOPHOCLIS TRAGOEDIAE, edited
by R. C. JEBB, M.A., Fellow and
Assistant Tutor of Trinity College,
Cambridge. The Electra. 3s. 6d.
The Ajax. 3s. 6d.

JUVENALIS SATIRAE, edited by
G. A. SIMCOX, M.A., Fellow and
Classical Lecturer of Queen's College,
Oxford. Thirteen Satires. 3s. 6d.

THUCYDIDIS HISTORIA, edited
by CHARLES BIGG, M.A., late Senior
Student and Tutor of Christ Church,
Oxford; Second Classical Master of
Cheltenham College. Books I. and
II. with Introductions. 6s.

DEMOSTHENIS ORATIONES
PUBLICAE, edited by G. H.
HESLOP, M.A., late Fellow and
Assistant Tutor of Queen's College,
Oxford; Head Master of St. Bees.

The Olynthiacs and the Philippics.
4s. 6d.

ARISTOPHANIS COMOEDIAE,
edited by W. C. GREEN, M.A., late
Fellow of King's College, Cambridge;
Classical Lecturer at Queen's College.

The Acharnians and the Knights.
4s.

The Clouds. 3s. 6d. The Wasps.
3s. 6d.

ISOCRATIS ORATIONES, edited
by JOHN EDWIN SANDYS, B.A.,
Fellow and Lecturer of St. John's
College, and Lecturer at Jesus Col-
lege, Cambridge.

Ad Demonium et Panegyricus.
4s. 6d.

PERSII SATIRAE, edited by A.
PRETOR, M.A., of Trinity College,
Cambridge; Classical Lecturer of
Trinity Hall. 3s. 6d.

*The following Parts are in course
of preparation:—*

PLATONIS PHAEDO, edited by
ALFRED BARRY, D.D., late Fellow
of Trinity College, Cambridge; Prin-
cipal of King's College, London.

DEMOSTHENIS ORATIONES
PUBLICAE, edited by G. H.
HESLOP, M.A., late Fellow and
Assistant Tutor of Queen's College,
Oxford; Head Master of St. Bees.

[De Falsa Legatione.

MARTIALIS EPIGRAMMATA,
edited by GEORGE BUTLER, M.A.,
Principal of Liverpool College; late
Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.

DEMOSTHENIS ORATIONES
PRIVATAE, edited by ARTHUR
HOLMES, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer
of Clare College, Cambridge.

[De Coronâ.

HOMERI ILIAS, edited by S. H.
REYNOLDS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor
of Brasenose College, Oxford.

[Books I. to XII.

HORATI OPERA, edited by J. M.
MARSHALL, M.A., Fellow and late
Lecturer of Brasenose College, Ox-
ford; one of the Masters in Clifton
College.

TERENTI COMOEDIAE, edited by
T. L. PAPILLON, M.A., one of the
Masters of Rugby.

HERODOTI HISTORIA, edited by
H. G. WOODS, M.A., Fellow and
Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford.

TACITI HISTORIAE, edited by W.
H. SIMCOX, M.A., Fellow and Lec-
turer of Queen's College, Oxford.

OVIDI TRISTIA, edited by OSCAR
BROWNING, M.A., Fellow of King's
College, Cambridge, and Assistant
Master at Eton College.

CICERONIS ORATIONES, edited
by CHARLES EDWARD GRAVES,
M.A., Classical Lecturer and late
Fellow of St. John's College, Cam-
bridge.

Part. I.—Pro Ligario et Pro
Rege Deiotaro.

RIVINGTONS,

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

